





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2021 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114652977>





DEBATES OF  
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF UNITED CANADA



Volume XIII  
Part I  
1856



DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA  
1841-1867

---

Centre d'étude du Québec

DEBATES OF  
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF UNITED CANADA

Volume XIII, Part I  
1856

Edited by  
Danielle Blais

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE ÉCONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALE DU QUÉBEC (CHE)  
1455 de Maisonneuve ouest, N-025, Montréal, Québec H3G 1M8

DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA  
1841-1867

Published under the direction of the  
Centre d'étude du Québec  
and the  
Centre de recherche en histoire économique et sociale du Québec (CHE)

CENTRE D'ÉTUDE DU QUÉBEC  
Room N-025, Sir George Williams of Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec  
H3G 1M8

Director: *Cameron Nish*  
Associate Director: *Jean Hamelin*

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE ÉCONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALE DU QUÉBEC (CHE)  
1455 de Maisonneuve ouest, N-025  
Montréal, Québec  
H3G 1M8

Directeur: *Pierre Harvey*  
Directeur de la recherche: *Cameron Nish*

---

The Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada are an undertaking of the Centre d'étude du Québec, and are published by the Centre de recherche en histoire économique et sociale du Québec (CHE). This Volume has been prepared and published with the help of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

# CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE  
ECONOMIQUE ET SOCIALE DU QUEBEC (CHE)  
Bureau N-025



O.D. REC'D. JAN 2 1989

## ERRATA

CA1  
x1  
D23

Une erreur s'est malencontreusement glissée à la page IV du **Volume XIII** **partie I** des "Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada". Afin de rectifier cette erreur et rendre justice aux organismes qui financent la publication de cette collection, auriez-vous l'obligeance de couvrir le paragraphe erroné à l'aide de l'auto-collant ci-joint. Le paragraphe à corriger est indiqué sur la photocopie jointe à cette note.

Merci.

---

## ERRATA

An omission was unfortunately made on page IV of **Volume XIII, Part I** of the "Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada". In order to do justice to the Federations which are funding the publication of this collection, please cover the incorrect paragraph with the enclosed corrective sticker, as shown in the photocopy found attached.

Thank you.

The publication of the **Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada** is an undertaking of the Centre de recherche en histoire économique et sociale du Québec (CHE). This Volume has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and the Social Science Federation of Canada, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.



DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF UNITED CANADA  
1841-1867

Published under the direction of the  
Centre d'étude du Québec  
and the  
Centre de recherche en histoire économique et sociale du Québec (CHE)

CENTRE D'ÉTUDE DU QUÉBEC  
Room N-025, Sir George Williams of Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec  
H3G 1M8

Director: *Cameron Nish*  
Associate Director: *Jean Hamelin*

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE EN HISTOIRE ÉCONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIALE DU QUÉBEC (CHE)  
1455 de Maisonneuve ouest, N-025  
Montréal, Québec  
H3G 1M8

Directeur: *Pierre Harvey*  
Directeur de la recherche: *Cameron Nish*

---

The Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada are an undertaking of the Centre d'étude du Québec, and are published by the Centre de recherche en histoire économique et sociale du Québec (CHE). This Volume has been prepared and published with the help of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.



#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jeannot Blackburn, Nicole Guérin, Brigitte Leclerc, Geneviève Legault, and Cynthia Parkinson assisted in the production of this volume. The following pages are a testimony to their careful labour and patience.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	ix
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	xi
EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS AND THEIR POSITIONS . . . . .	xv
MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY . . . . .	xvii
FRIDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	1
MONDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	13
TUESDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	34
WEDNESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	45
THURSDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	91
FRIDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	147
MONDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	196
TUESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	261
WEDNESDAY, 27 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	333
THURSDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	371
FRIDAY, 29 FEBRUARY 1856 . . . . .	405
SATURDAY, 1 MARCH 1856 . . . . .	432
MONDAY, 3 MARCH 1856 . . . . .	438
TUESDAY, 4 MARCH 1856 . . . . .	457
WEDNESDAY, 5 MARCH 1856 . . . . .	477
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES . . . . .	519



## PREFACE

The Introduction to the first Volume of this series, *Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada, 1841*, included a history of parliamentary reporting in Britain, Upper and Lower Canada, and of course Union Canada. Parliamentary reporting was both an institution inextricably bound up with Parliament, and a profession under the patronage of the commercial Press. Its constitutional and practical development was traced, including the influences of the ancestral British system upon its derivative Canadian transplants. In the Chapters dealing specifically with the Canadas, the local conditions modifying the original British model were discussed in detail. The most important of these were: the bilingualism of the Lower and United Canada Legislatures; the political biases of parliamentary reporters who also lacked stenographic skills; and poor accommodations and worse acoustics in the House. The result of all this was that on the whole, Canadian parliamentary reporters were limited to providing third person summaries of the speeches. Essentially, parliamentary reporting was a politically-oriented profession which was also an integral part of the world of journalism.

All kinds of data about parliamentary reporting as an institution and as a profession were considered: the policies of its newspaper patrons; its techniques; the skills and foibles of its personnel; and the problems such as accommodation in the legislative buildings faced by the reporters. The other record of parliamentary proceedings, the official JOURNALS, was also analysed. On the basis of this analysis of the reports and the JOURNALS, a methodology was elaborated which involved collating the reports and integrating them into the JOURNALS.<sup>1</sup> The object of that methodology was to produce a verisimilar record of the parliamentary debates and proceedings. Since verbatim reporting was virtually unknown, verisimilitude was the only possible goal. Various problems were anticipated and their solutions incorporated into the methodology. Each methodological step was explained and then implemented, thus producing the Canadian HANSARD.

---

1. In this way the entire texts of the JOURNALS are reproduced in the reconstructed HANSARD. Also included are references to Appendices to the JOURNALS, although these Appendices, often volumes long, are not reproduced in this work.



## INTRODUCTION

The theoretical methodology applied for reconstructing the Debates of the Legislative Assembly of United Canada has remained unchanged since the inception of the first Volume, except for minor changes in practical application. The most important change from one year to the next is the basic source material, the newspapers containing the parliamentary reports, which are selected according to their availability on microfilm. For the session of 1856 sixteen newspapers were consulted, the chief characteristics of which are described in the following table.

The reasons for including such newspapers as the MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT, the PILOT, the QUEBEC GAZETTE, and the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (Scrapbook Hansard) were explained in detail in the Introduction to Volume I. Briefly, they printed parliamentary reports collated from various available sources. Thus they provide a check against missing debates from single issues or even entire newspaper runs which have not been preserved.

The technique used to footnote the collated debates does more than identify the sources from which material is drawn. The footnotes also explain any variations in the methodology, and give certain details useful for understanding the debates. There are five main rules for footnotes. 1) The transcribed text of each member's speech is identified. When a single speech has been reconstructed from reports in more than one newspaper, the source of each specific portion of the speech is identified. 2) For the debates of the Fifth Parliament, Second Session, alternate sources consulted but not selected are not included in the footnotes, although comparisons of various reports are still made to determine which have been copied, edited or paraphrased from another report. The original source is used to reconstruct the debate, except where it is illegible; in such cases an identical alternate source is used for all or part of any debate or speech. 3) Commentaries on the debate in question are noted, and when deemed of special significance, are transcribed verbatim. 4) Any information which is provided by newspapers concerning Bills ultimately rejected in the House is reported in footnote, whether or not these Bills are debated. 5) The footnotes include any additional information necessary to explain the methodology adopted in dealing with situations which do not conform to any of the models described. 6) One of this project's fundamental assumptions is that the JOURNALS' account of proceedings was correct though not always complete. However, there are occasional discrepancies between the JOURNALS and the newspaper reports. These discrepancies are always noted. For example, sometimes the names of movers and seconders are different in the newspapers and the JOURNALS. In these cases the alternate names are listed in a footnote.

The Appendices to each day's proceedings are entirely supplementary to the JOURNALS. The Appendices contain: 1) notices of motions for Bills, Addresses, etc.; 2) notices of questions; 3) questions and answers; 4) debates on withdrawn and postponed motions; 5) other announcements or discussions which are not recorded in

NEWSPAPERS	DISTRICT/ SECTION	LANGUAGE	POLITICAL ORIENTATION	WEEKLY DISTRIBUTION	ORIGIN OF REPORTS
L'AVENIR	Montreal, L.C.	French	Radical reform	Once	Short original reports.
GLOBE	Toronto, U.C.	English	Radical reform	Daily	Original, occasionally translated individual speeches from LE PAYS.
HAMILTON SEMI-WEEKLY SPECTATOR	Hamilton, U.C.	English	Conservative	Twice	Often copied TORONTO DAILY LEADER, but also provided original reports.
MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE	Toronto, U.C.	English	Radical reform	Once	Sometimes original, sometimes copied.
LA MINERVE	Montréal, L.C.	French	Conservative	Twice/Thrice	Often original, sometimes translated from L.C. newspapers.
MONTREAL GAZETTE	Montréal, L.C.	English	Conservative	Daily	Original.
MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT	Montréal, L.C.	English	Conservative	Thrice/Daily	Copied other L.C. newspapers.
NIAGARA MAIL	Niagara, U.C.	English	Reform	Once	Short original reports, or copied U.C. newspapers.
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (SCRAPBOOK HANSARD)	-----	English	-----	Daily	Selected daily by Parliamentary Librarian from various U.C. and L.C. newspapers.
LE PAYS	Montréal, L.C.	French	Radical reform	Thrice	Often original, sometimes translated from L.C. newspapers.
PERTH COURIER (1834-57 BATHURST COURIER)	Perth, U.C.	English	Reform	Once	Copied U.C. and L.C. newspapers.
PILOT	Montréal, L.C.	English	Reform	Daily	Sometimes original, often copied or paraphrased from other newspapers.
QUEBEC GAZETTE	Québec, L.C.	English	Moderate conservative	Thrice	Sometimes original, but mostly copied MONTREAL GAZETTE.
QUEBEC MORNING CHRONICLE	Québec, L.C.	English	Conservative	Daily	Sometimes original, but mostly copied MONTREAL GAZETTE.
TORONTO DAILY LEADER	Toronto, U.C.	English	Reform	Daily	Original.
WESTERN PLANET	Chatham, U.C.	English	Conservative	Twice	Often copied U.C. and L.C. newspapers, sometimes provided short original reports.

the JOURNALS and which cannot be placed in the body of the debates. A substantial part of the Appendices consists of notices of motions. The third category in the Appendices is for questions and answers. Despite their importance, they were not recorded in the JOURNALS unless incorporated into a formal motion or Address. All questions and answers reported in the newspapers are included in the Appendix for the appropriate day. Debates on withdrawn motions, fully reported in our Appendices, are interesting because they appear nowhere in any official record, and would otherwise be lost to posterity. On some occasions newspapers record conversations or asides which are not directly related to business before the Assembly. These too are always included in the Appendices.

The technical forms used remain essentially unchanged from those of preceding volumes: 1) The spelling of members' names at the opening of each individual speech is standardized. Changes from the spelling in the newspapers are not noted. The names most commonly misspelled in newspapers are Clark instead of Clarke; McNab, Macnab, M'Nab instead of MacNab; McKenzie instead of Mackenzie; and various spellings of Macdonald. All spelling of names within a speech is left unchanged. 2) In some accounts of a particular speech the speaker will not be distinguished from others with the same surname, for instance in the case of the Messrs. Smith. The account may simply report that "Mr. Smith spoke". If another newspaper that is not being used to reconstruct the speech indicates the individual, either by using an initial or stating his constituency, and provides a very similar speech, the distinction is made in the text of the debate without crediting the source. Speeches where the individual speaker cannot be identified other than by his surname are indexed in the Proper Names Index to all persons bearing that name, and a (?) follows the page number. 3) Whenever a member was reported to have spoken in English or in French, this fact is noted. For example, "Mr. Cauchon (in French)", whether or not there exists a report of the speech in the language of delivery. 4) The entire text of the JOURNALS is replicated in italic print. The JOURNALS' page numbers are inserted in parentheses within the reconstructed text. 5) The GLOBE often provided reprints of reports from various other newspapers, which are not available on microfilm. When such sources are used, both the name of the newspapers and the reference to the GLOBE's issue are given. 6) The parentheses and square brackets used in the newspapers are alike replicated in the reconstructed text by parentheses. The square brackets contain our own insertions, whether to correct an omission or to clarify the meaning. When, for the sake of clarity, we must interpolate a word, we stay as close as possible to the usual style of the newspaper. 7) Words such as "expence", "controul", "shew", "fyle", and the French "tems" and "fesait", are reproduced without using the term (*sic*), because these spellings were widely used and acceptable in the 19th Century. The *Oxford English Dictionary*, the *Dictionnaire Beauchemin Canadien*, and the *Trésor de la langue française*, are our references to proper spelling. 8) When it is necessary to reconstruct a sentence from excerpts drawn from more than one source, the problem of punctuation becomes acute. The strict application of ellipsis, added to the necessary footnote number, is both unwieldy and difficult to assimilate at first reading. As a result, another means of expressing the ellipsis had to be devised. A simple method was adopted, which is also used in sentences which are not reproduced in full, but are cut off before the end. Appropriate punctuation integrates the various excerpts, replacing the awkward ellipses. This editorially imposed punctuation is indicated by the simple expedient of placing the footnote reference immediately following the text, but before our punctuation. Conversely, whenever a footnote follows punctuation, that punctuation has been reproduced from the text of the newspaper. For example, the sentence "SIR A. MACNAB said that he would go to town..."<sup>1</sup>

he meant to the town of Three Rivers...<sup>2</sup> as soon as possible....<sup>3</sup>" becomes "SIR A. MACNAB said that he would go to town<sup>1</sup>, he meant to the town of Three Rivers<sup>2</sup>, as soon as possible<sup>3</sup>."

The style and methodology are designed in all ways to achieve the goal of a verisimilar account of the debates of the Legislative Assembly. The texts are completely unretouched; even grammatical and spelling errors remain uncorrected. One of the reasons for this decision to sacrifice style to fidelity was that the reader or student can best use his own judgment if he has the original material before him. He can then decide how to use the material: he can reproduce it exactly, or he can edit it and improve upon its style in whatever way he judges most appropriate. The only editing imposed upon the work has never been for purposes of literary style, but only to render collated passages less disjointed, truncated and confusing. The criterion is never that a passage was awkwardly phrased, but rather that it was incoherent. For example, even the habitual tense changes are never altered to make them consistent so that not infrequently speakers in one debate are reported each in a different tense. In a fairly typical debate, "MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY thinks" while "CAPT. RHODES said" and "MR. A. DORION had opposed". The real editing work occurs in the earlier stage of the work, when the passages here reproduced as the reconstructed debates are selected. Therefore all elegancies of language are gratuitous, and such texts are invariably selected for content and not because of the felicity with which they are expressed.

The subject Index for the 1856 session will be contained in the final Part of Volume XIII.

EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS  
AND THEIR POSITIONS

FIFTH PARLIAMENT, SECOND SESSION  
15 FEBRUARY 1856 - 1 JULY 1856

	FROM	TO
<b>CARTIER, Georges Etienne</b>		
Member of Executive Council . . . . .	27 Jan. 1855	29 July 1858
Provincial Secretary . . . . .	27 Jan. 1855	23 May 1856
Attorney General (L.C.) . . . . .	24 May 1856	29 July 1858
<b>CAUCHON, Joseph Edouard</b>		
Member of Executive Council, and Commissioner of Crown Lands . . . .	27 Jan. 1855	30 April 1857
<b>CAYLEY, William</b>		
Member of Executive Council, Inspector General, and Member of Board of Railway Commissioners . . . .	11 Sept. 1854	29 July 1858
Government Director of Grand Trunk Railway . . . . .	3 Nov. 1854	28 July 1857
<b>DRUMMOND, Lewis Thomas</b>		
Member of Executive Council, and Attorney General (L.C.) . . . . .	28 Oct. 1851	23 May 1856
Government Director of Grand Trunk Railway . . . . .	20 Nov. 1852	23 May 1856
<b>LEMIEUX, François Xavier</b>		
Member of Executive Council, Chief Commissioner of Public Works, and Member of Board of Railway Commissioners . . . . .	27 Jan. 1855	25 Nov. 1857
<b>MACDONALD, John Alexander</b>		
Member of Executive Council, and Attorney General (U.C.) . . . . .	11 Sept. 1854	29 July 1858
<b>MACNAB, Sir Allan Napier</b>		
Member and President of the Executive Council, and Minister of Agriculture . . . . .	11 Sept. 1854	23 May 1856
Government Director of Grand Trunk Railway . . . . .	3 Nov. 1854	28 July 1857

	FROM	TO
<b>MORRISON, Joseph Curran</b> Member of Executive Council, Receiver General, and Member of Board of Railway Commissioners . . . .	24 May 1856	2 Feb. 1858
<b>ROSS, John *</b> Member of Executive Council . . . . .	22 June 1853	18 April 1856
Speaker of Legislative Council . . . . .	11 Sept. 1854	18 April 1856
Government Director of Grand Trunk Railway . . . . .	11 Nov. 1852	28 July 1857
Member of Legislative Council . . . . .	1 Dec. 1848	30 June 1867
<b>SPENCE, Robert</b> Member of Executive Council, Postmaster General, and Member of Board of Railway Commissioners . . . .	11 Sept. 1854	1 Feb. 1858
<b>TACHÉ, Etienne Paschal *</b> Member of Executive Council . . . . .	11 March 1848	25 Nov. 1857
Receiver General . . . . .	27 Nov. 1849	23 May 1856
Member of Legislative Council . . . . .	23 May 1848	30 July 1865
Speaker of Legislative Council . . . . .	19 April 1856	25 Nov. 1857
Member of Board of Railway Commissioners . . . . .	30 August 1851	23 May 1856
Government Director of Grand Trunk Railway . . . . .	20 Nov. 1852	28 July 1857
<b>TERRILL, Timothy Lee</b> Member of Executive Council . . . . .	24 May 1856	9 Nov. 1857
Provincial Secretary . . . . .	24 May 1856	25 Nov. 1857
<b>VANKOUGHNET, Philip Michael Scott *</b> Member and President of the Executive Council, and Minister of Agriculture . . . . .	24 May 1856	29 July 1858

\* Messrs. Ross, Taché, and Vankoughnet did not hold seats in the Legislative Assembly in the Fifth Parliament.

# MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THEIR CONSTITUENCIES

FIFTH PARLIAMENT, SECOND SESSION  
15 FEBRUARY 1856 - 1 JULY 1856

List of the Members from 15 February 1856 to 23 May 1856

Aikins, James Cox . . . . .	Peel (U.C.)
Alleyn, Charles . . . . .	Quebec City (L.C.)
Bell, Robert . . . . .	Lanark North (U.C.)
Bellingham, Sydney . . . . .	Argenteuil (L.C.)
Biggar, Herbert . . . . .	Brant West (U.C.)
Blanchet, Jean . . . . .	Quebec City (L.C.)
Bourassa, François . . . . .	St. Johns (L.C.)
Bowes, John George . . . . .	Toronto (U.C.)
Brodeur, Timothée . . . . .	Bagot (L.C.)
Brown, George . . . . .	Lambton (U.C.)
Bureau, Jacques Olivier . . . . .	Napierville (L.C.)
Burton, Francis H. . . . .	Durham East (U.C.)
Cameron, John Hillyard . . . . .	Toronto (U.C.)
Cartier, Georges Etienne . . . . .	Verchères (L.C.)
Casault, Louis Eldemar Napoléon . . . . .	Montmagny (L.C.)
Cauchon, Joseph Edouard . . . . .	Montmorency (L.C.)
Cayley, William . . . . .	Huron and Bruce (U.C.)
Chabot, Jean . . . . .	Quebec City (L.C.)
Chapais, Jean Charles . . . . .	Kamouraska (L.C.)
Chisholm, George King . . . . .	Halton (U.C.)
Christie, David . . . . .	Brant East (U.C.)
Church, Basil Rorison . . . . .	Leeds and Grenville North (U.C.)
Clarke, William . . . . .	Wellington North (U.C.)
Conger, Wilson Seymour . . . . .	Peterborough (U.C.)
Cook, Ephraim . . . . .	Oxford South (U.C.)
Cooke, Alanson . . . . .	Ottawa County (L.C.)
Crawford, George . . . . .	Brockville (U.C.)
Crysler, John Pliny . . . . .	Dundas (U.C.)
Daly, Thomas Mayne . . . . .	Perth (U.C.)
Daoust, Charles . . . . .	Beauharnois (L.C.)
Daoust, Jean Baptiste . . . . .	Two Mountains (L.C.)
Darche, Noël . . . . .	Chambly (L.C.)
Delong, Jesse . . . . .	Leeds South (U.C.)
Desaulniers, Louis Léon Lesieur . . . . .	St. Maurice (L.C.)
Dewitt, Jacob . . . . .	Chateauguay (L.C.)
Dionne, Benjamin . . . . .	Témiscouata (L.C.)
Dorion, Antoine Aimé . . . . .	Montreal City (L.C.)
Dorion, Jean Baptiste Eric . . . . .	Drummond and Arthabaska (L.C.)
Dostaler, Pierre Eustache . . . . .	Berthier (L.C.)
Drummond, Lewis Thomas . . . . .	Shefford (L.C.)

Dufresne, Joseph . . . . .	Montcalm (L.C.)
Egan, John . . . . .	Pontiac (L.C.)
Evanturel, François . . . . .	Quebec County (L.C.)
Fellowes (see Lyon)	
Felton, William Locker Pickmore . . . . .	Sherbrooke and Wolfe (L.C.)
Fergusson, Adam Johnston . . . . .	Wellington South (U.C.)
Ferres, James Moir . . . . .	Missisquoi East (L.C.)
Ferrie, Robert . . . . .	Waterloo South (U.C.)
Flint, Billa . . . . .	Hastings South (U.C.)
Foley, Michael Hamilton . . . . .	Waterloo North (U.C.)
Fortier, Octave Cyrille . . . . .	Bellechasse (L.C.)
Fortier, Thomas . . . . .	Nicolet (L.C.)
Fournier, Charles François . . . . .	L'Islet (L.C.)
Frazer, John . . . . .	Welland (U.C.)
Freeman, Samuel Black . . . . .	Wentworth South (U.C.)
Galt, Alexander Tilloch . . . . .	Sherbrooke Town (L.C.)
Gamble, John William . . . . .	York West (U.C.)
Gill, Ignace . . . . .	Yamaska (L.C.)
Gould, Joseph . . . . .	Ontario North (U.C.)
Guévremont, Jean Baptiste . . . . .	Richelieu (L.C.)
Hartman, Joseph . . . . .	York North (U.C.)
Holton, Luther Hamilton . . . . .	Montreal City (L.C.)
Huot, Pierre Gabriel . . . . .	Saguenay (L.C.)
Jackson, George . . . . .	Grey (U.C.)
Jobin, Joseph Hilarion . . . . .	Joliette (L.C.)
Labelle, Pierre . . . . .	Laval (L.C.)
Laberge, Charles Joseph . . . . .	Iberville (L.C.)
Laporte, Joseph . . . . .	Montreal Hochelaga (L.C.)
Larwill, Edwin . . . . .	Kent (U.C.)
LeBoutillier, John . . . . .	Gaspé (L.C.)
Lemieux, François Xavier . . . . .	Levis (L.C.)
Loranger, Thomas Jean Jacques . . . . .	Laprairie (L.C.)
Lumsden, John MacVeigh . . . . .	Ontario South (U.C.)
Lyon (Fellowes), George Byron . . . . .	Russell (U.C.)
Macbeth, George . . . . .	Elgin West (U.C.)
McCann, Henry Wellesly . . . . .	Prescott (U.C.)
MacDonald, John Alexander . . . . .	Kingston (U.C.)
MacDonald, John Sandfield . . . . .	Glengarry (U.C.)
McDonald, Roderick . . . . .	Cornwall (U.C.)
Mackenzie, William Lyon . . . . .	Haldimand (U.C.)
MacNab, Allan Napier . . . . .	Hamilton (U.C.)
Marchildon, Thomas . . . . .	Champlain (L.C.)
Masson, Luc Hyacinthe . . . . .	Soulanges (L.C.)
Matheson, Donald . . . . .	Oxford North (U.C.)
Mattice, William . . . . .	Stormont (U.C.)
Meagher, John . . . . .	Bonaventure (L.C.)
Merritt, William Hamilton . . . . .	Lincoln (U.C.)
Mongenais, Jean Baptiste . . . . .	Vaudreuil (L.C.)
Morrison, Angus . . . . .	Simcoe North (U.C.)
Morrison, Joseph Curran . . . . .	Niagara (U.C.)
Munro, Henry . . . . .	Durham West (U.C.)
Murney, Edmund . . . . .	Hastings North (U.C.)
Niles, William E. . . . .	Middlesex East (U.C.)

O'Farrell, John . . . . .	Lotbinière (L.C.)
Papin, Joseph . . . . .	L'Assomption (L.C.)
Patrick, William . . . . .	Grenville South (U.C.)
Polette, Antoine . . . . .	Three Rivers (L.C.)
Poulin, Joseph Napoléon . . . . .	Rouville (L.C.)
Pouliot, Barthelemy . . . . .	Dorchester (L.C.)
Powell, William Frederick . . . . .	Carleton (U.C.)
Prévost, Gédéon Mélasippe . . . . .	Terrebonne (L.C.)
Price, David Edward . . . . .	Chicoutimi and Tadoussac (L.C.)
Rankin, Arthur . . . . .	Essex (U.C.)
Rhodes, William . . . . .	Megantic (L.C.)
Robinson, William Benjamin . . . . .	Simcoe South (U.C.)
Roblin, David . . . . .	Lennox and Addington (U.C.)
Rolph, John . . . . .	Norfolk (U.C.)
Ross, Dunbar . . . . .	Beauce (L.C.)
Ross, James . . . . .	Northumberland East (U.C.)
Sanborn, John Sewell . . . . .	Compton (L.C.)
Scatcherd, John . . . . .	Middlesex West (U.C.)
Shaw, James . . . . .	Lanark South (U.C.)
Sicotte, Louis Victor . . . . .	St. Hyacinthe (L.C.)
Smith, Henry . . . . .	Frontenac (U.C.)
Smith, James . . . . .	Victoria (U.C.)
Smith, Sidney . . . . .	Northumberland West (U.C.)
Somerville, Robert Brown . . . . .	Huntingdon (L.C.)
Southwick, George . . . . .	Elgin East (U.C.)
Spence, Robert . . . . .	Wentworth North (U.C.)
Stevenson, David Barker . . . . .	Prince Edward (U.C.)
Supple, James <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	Renfrew (U.C.)
Taché, Joseph Charles . . . . .	Rimouski (L.C.)
Terrill, Timothy Lee . . . . .	Stanstead (L.C.)
Thibaudeau, Joseph Elie . . . . .	Portneuf (L.C.)
Turcotte, Joseph Edouard . . . . .	Maskinongé (L.C.)
Valois, Michel François . . . . .	Montreal Jacques Cartier (L.C.)
Whitney, Hannibal Hodges . . . . .	Missisquoi West (L.C.)
Wilson, John . . . . .	London (U.C.)
Wright, Amos . . . . .	York East (U.C.)
Yeilding, Agar . . . . .	Bytown (U.C.)
Young, John . . . . .	Montreal City (L.C.)

---

1. J. Supple was elected to represent Renfrew on the 31st March 1856, in replacement of Mr. Francis Hincks who resigned on the 16th November 1855.



FRIDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 1856.<sup>1</sup>

The House met shortly after 3 p.m., and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. Mr. Sicotte, taking the chair.<sup>2</sup>

The members ... present were, Sir Allan MacNab, J.A. Macdonald, Drummond, J.S. Macdonald, Brown, Cartier, Rolph, Cauchon, J.C. Morrison, Murney, Lumsden, Cameron, Masson, A.A. Dorion, J.B.E. Dorion, Foley, Spence, Robinson, Mackenzie, Merritt, Lemieux, Solicitor General Smith, J. Smith, Sidney Smith, Freeman, Wilson, Christie, Hartman, Holton, Jackson, Gould, Wright, Dufresne, McCann, Aikins, Bourassa, Chapais, Gamble, Macbeth, Bowes, Loranger, Gill, Larwill, Bureau, Prevost, Conger, A. Morrison, Clarke, Scatcherd, Crawford, R. Macdonald, Niles, Cook, Ferres, Dionne, Rankin, Whitney, Stevenson, Dostaler, Fraser, Ferrie, C. Daoust, Mattice, Darche, Jobin, Chisholm, Valois, Bell, Brodeur, Thibaudeau and Guévremont.<sup>3</sup>

(1)

A MESSAGE from His Excellency the Governor General, by René Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:--

Mr. Speaker,

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honorable House in the Legislative Council Chamber.<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Council Chamber, And being returned;<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, That during the recess he had received the resignation of the Honorable Jean Chabot, one of the Members of the City of Quebec, whose Election had been contested; and also, a Notice from the Petitioners contesting the same, that they have withdrawn their contestation; but that inasmuch as the Select Committee appointed to try the merits of the said contestation had not made a Report, he did not deem himself authorized to issue his warrant for a new Election.<sup>6</sup>

Mr. Speaker also acquainted the House, That during the recess he had received the following Notifications of the acceptance of Office by the Honorable Members representing the Counties of Quebec and Peterborough; and that he had issued his Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new Writs for the Election of Members to represent the said Counties:--

Province of Canada.

To the Honorable Louis Victor Sicotte, Speaker of the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada.

We, the undersigned, Napoléon Casault, duly elected Member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, to represent therein the County of Montmagny,

(2)

and John O'Farrell, duly elected Member of the said Legislative Assembly, to represent therein the County of Lotbinière, do hereby make known and declare unto you the said Louis Victor Sicotte, that the Honorable Pierre Joseph Olivier Chauveau, who, by the Report of the Returning Officer for the County of Quebec, was returned to you as duly elected to represent the said County of Quebec in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, hath, since being so returned, accepted the Office of Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada.

And we do hereby require you the said Louis Victor Sicotte, in your capacity aforesaid, to issue a Writ for the Election of a new Member to represent the said County of Quebec, in the room and stead of the said Honorable Pierre Joseph Olivier Chauveau, in the manner and form prescribed by the Statutes in such case made and provided.

Witness our hands and seals at the City of Quebec, in the said Province of Canada, this tenth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

N. Casault, M.P.P., (L.S.)

J. O'Farrell, M.P.P., (L.S.)

To the Honorable Louis Victor Sicotte, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Canada.

We, James Smith, Member of the Legislative Assembly for the County of Victoria, and Joseph C. Morrison, Member of the said Assembly for the Town of Niagara, do hereby inform you, that a vacancy has happened in the said Legislative Assembly, by the acceptance, by John Langton, Esquire, Member of the same for the County of Peterborough, of the Office of Auditor, from the Crown; and we inform you thereof, with the view of having the said vacancy filled.

Dated at Toronto, the twenty-second day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five, as Witness our hands and seals.

James Smith, (L.S.)

Joseph C. Morrison, (L.S.)

Mr. Speaker then acquainted the House, That the Clerk of this House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the following Certificates:--

Province of Canada.

This is to certify, that in virtue of a Writ of Election, dated the twelfth July last past, issued by His Excellency the Governor General, and addressed to the Registrar of the County of Quebec, Charles Nathaniel Montizambert, Esquire, Returning Officer, ex-officio, for the County of Quebec, for the election of a Member to represent the said County of Quebec in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the present Parliament, in the room of Pierre Joseph Olivier Chauveau, Esquire, who, since his election, as the Representative of the said County of Quebec, had accepted an Office of profit under the Crown, to wit: the Office of Superintendent of Education for Lower Canada, by means whereof the seat of the said Pierre Joseph Olivier Chauveau, Esquire, as the Representative of the said County of Quebec, had become vacant; François Evanturel, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected accordingly, as appears by the Return to the said Writ of Election, dated the seventh day of August, instant, which is now lodged of record in my office.

Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,  
Quebec, 21st August, 1855,

Félix Fortier,

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

[To] William Burns Lindsay, Esquire,  
Clerk, Legislative Assembly.

(3)

Province of Canada.

This is to certify, that in virtue of a Writ of Election, dated the thirty-first December last, issued by His Excellency the Governor General, and addressed to the Registrar of the United Counties of Peterborough and Victoria, Charles Rubidge, Esquire, Returning Officer for the County of Peterborough, for the election of a Member to represent the said County of Peterborough in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in the present Parliament, in the room of John Langton, Esquire, who, since his election as the Representative of the said County of Peterborough, had accepted an Office of profit under the Crown, to wit: the Office of Auditor, by

means whereof the seat of the said John Langton, Esquire, as the Representative of the said County of Peterborough, had become vacant; Wilson Seymour Conger, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected accordingly, as appears by the Return of the said Writ of Election, dated the twenty-sixth day of January last, which is now lodged of record in my office.

Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,  
Toronto, 9th February, 1856,

Félix Fortier,

Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

To William Burns Lindsay, Esquire,  
Clerk, Legislative Assembly.

François Evanturel, Esquire, Member for the County of Quebec, and Wilson Seymour Conger, Esquire, Member for the County of Peterborough, having previously taken the Oath, according to law, and subscribed before the Commissioners the Roll containing the same, took their seats in the House.

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER also intimated that he had received a communication from the Hon. Mr. Hincks, resigning his seat for the County of Renfrew, and stated that he had issued a new writ.<sup>7</sup>

On enquiry by MR. BROWN,<sup>8</sup>

It was elicited that the resignation was dated in November, but that it had only come into the Speaker's hands in February.<sup>9</sup>

(3)

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, That on the ninth day of February, instant, he received the resignation of the Honorable Francis Hincks, Member for the County of Renfrew, bearing date the sixteenth day of November last, and the same was read, as followeth:--

Province of Canada.

To the Honorable Louis Victor Sicotte, Esquire, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada.

I, the undersigned, the Honorable Francis Hincks, of the Parish of Quebec, in the District of Quebec, Esquire, a Member legally elected to represent the County of Renfrew in the Parliament of Canada, do hereby declare unto you the said Speaker of the said Legislative Assembly, that being desirous of abstaining for the future from the performance of the duties imposed upon me by my election as such Representative of the said County of Renfrew in the said Parliament of Canada, and availing myself of the provisions of the Statutes in such case made and provided, I do hereby resign and vacate my seat in the said Legislative Assembly as such Representative of the said County of Renfrew.

Thus done and executed under my hand and seal, at the City of Quebec, in the said Province, this sixteenth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five.

F. Hincks, (L.S.)

The foregoing declaration, signed, sealed and delivered by the said Francis Hincks, at the said City of Quebec, on the day and year therein mentioned, in presence of us the undersigned Witnesses.

Willis Russell, of Quebec, Hotel Keeper.

Dunbar Ross, of Quebec, M.P.P., Solicitor General, L.C.

Ordered, That the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab have leave to bring in a Bill to

(4)

provide for the administration of the Oaths of Office to persons appointed to be Justices of the Peace, in this Province.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time.<sup>10</sup>

Mr. Speaker reported, That when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Legislative Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of the Provincial Parliament, of which Mr. Speaker said he had, to prevent mistakes, obtained a copy;

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER stated that ... he would read it if it was the pleasure of the House.<sup>11</sup>

(4)

which he read to the House, as followeth:--<sup>12</sup>

Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council,

Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly:

I have thought it right to call you together at this season, because I believed it to be the wish of the Country that your task of legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and because it is at once the desire and the duty of the Executive Government, to profit by your advice and assistance when it may be most conveniently afforded.

In referring to the labours of your last Session, I cannot help congratulating you on having settled the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. You will find, I believe, a large balance of funds arising from this source, available for distribution among the Municipalities, but I think it likely that your assistance as Legislators may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums.

In Lower Canada, the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. No time has been lost by me in acting on the powers conferred by this law, and I trust that you will be satisfied with the progress which has been made.

The subject of a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council by rendering it Elective, will again be brought before you.

A measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown, for the prevention of crime, and the speedy apprehension of offenders, deserves your attentive consideration.

The increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law, and by the perfect sense of security from outrage.

It is to you that I must look for the power of ensuring these great objects.

I have spoken of our increasing prosperity. No mark of its existence can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. Nor is this progress confined to one Section of the Province. Eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, these lines, at once the sign and the cause of progress, are already completed. I may congratulate you on the fact that since your last meeting, nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that not less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year.

Legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. One measure at least will be submitted to you, having reference to this important subject. It may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that you desire; yet I trust that some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure and facilitating the working of our Courts, by the adoption of practical amendments.

I should see with great satisfaction the adoption by you of any general measure which tended still more to abridge your legislative labours in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind.

(5)

I regret to say that the presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which I have directed to be laid before you, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols.

Your zeal in the cause of Education is known and appreciated by all the world. It is important to consider whether we cannot combine the reform of the juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes. At the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice.

The Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and it will, I trust, contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts.

With regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled me to authorize the formation of numerous troops and companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province. I have moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done my best to carry out your wishes by organizing the Sedentary Militia.

The Government in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, has taken on itself to conclude a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season.

That the timber trade has been depressed is a deep source of regret to me and to all others who have at heart the welfare of the Province. I trust that we are about to witness its revival, and that the commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check.

Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly,

The Accounts for the past year and the Estimates for the present will be laid before you.

You will find that, on the whole, our finances are in a satisfactory state. The people at large have reaped the benefit of those reductions in the Customs Duties which you made last year.

The diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to you by my advisers. A large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, but I conceive that any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce, and by the facility of intercourse between the two Countries.

It will be the duty of my Council to ask you in the present Session for such Supplies for Her Most Gracious Majesty, as you may see fit to grant.

Honorable Gentlemen, and Gentlemen,

The year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe: on this side of the Atlantic we have, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. In no part, however, of the Queen's Dominions, has deeper sympathy with her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered, than in Canada.

*Our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the Allied Armies.*

*In like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honourable peace, Canada will, I doubt not, rejoice at the termination of the war. May it be my lot before the end of the present Session, to congratulate you on so auspicious an event.*

*At present, I have only to leave you to the discharge of your important duties.*

The Speech having been read<sup>13</sup>,

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB moved, seconded by MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH, that the Speech from the Throne be taken into consideration on Monday next.<sup>14</sup>

MR. BROWN said that they would be prepared to go on ... Monday, provided those members not present would be here by that time. If they were not present, it perhaps could be postponed till Tuesday<sup>15</sup>, to allow time for the amendments to be prepared and printed.<sup>16</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB stated his wish at once to change the motion to Tuesday if it would be more convenient.<sup>17</sup>

MR. MERRITT regretted that it should be put off at all. Honorable members should come prepared to go on with the business.<sup>18</sup>

MR. BROWN said that he was prepared, but there were several members not yet present, and they might be here to-morrow or Monday at farthest.<sup>19</sup>

The motion was then altered to Tuesday<sup>20</sup>.

(6)

*On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*Ordered, That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Provincial Legislature be taken into consideration, on Tuesday next.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB moved, seconded by MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, that the votes and proceedings of this House be printed by a person appointed by the Speaker, after having been first revised by the Speaker; and that no person but the one so appointed be permitted to print the same.<sup>21</sup>

(6)

*Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker, and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.*

[On motion of] MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB, seconded by MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND,<sup>22</sup>

(6)

*Resolved, That Select Standing Committees of this House for the present Session be appointed for the following purposes:--1. On Privileges and Elections. 2. On Expiring Laws. 3. On Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines. 4. On Miscellaneous*

*Private Bills. 5. On Standing Orders. 6. On Printing. 7. On Contingencies. 8. On the Public Accounts;--which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time, their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB gave notice that he would move on Monday the appointment of a select committee to strike the above standing committees.<sup>23</sup>

(6)

*Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, That he had received from the Commissioner appointed for the examination of Witnesses on the trial of the Petition complaining of an undue Election and Return for the City of Quebec, a copy of his proceedings under the said Commission.*

*Mr. Speaker further acquainted the House, That he had on the first of February instant, issued his Warrant for the re-assembling of the Select Committee on the City of Quebec Election Petition, on the twentieth day of February instant, provided Parliament shall be then sitting, and in case Parliament shall not be then sitting, then on the third Monday next after the commencement of the then next Session of Parliament, to take the proceedings of the said Commission into consideration.*

*Mr. Speaker also acquainted the House, That he had received from the Commissioner appointed for the examination of Witnesses on the trial of the Petition complaining of an undue Election and Return for the County of Argenteuil, a copy of his proceedings under the said Commission.*

*Mr. Speaker further acquainted the House, That he had on the first of February instant, issued his Warrant for the re-assembling of the Select Committee on the Argenteuil Election Petition, on the twenty-sixth day of February instant, provided Parliament shall be then sitting, and in case Parliament shall not be then sitting, then on the third Monday next after the commencement of the then next Session of Parliament, to take the proceedings of the said Commission into consideration.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB then moved that the House do now adjourn.<sup>24</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE asked for permission to present in the first place a few petitions, which the hon. member proceeded to do.<sup>25</sup>

MR. HARTMAN also presented several petitions, among them one from the Municipal Council of the United Counties of York and Peel, against Separate Sectarian Schools.

The hon. member asked permission of the House to read the same, which was granted.<sup>26</sup>

The reading of the petition called forth repeated hear, hears from the House, and applause from the galleries.<sup>27</sup>

MR. ROBINSON presented a petition from the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe, on the subject of Separate Schools.<sup>28</sup>

MR. BROWN.--On which side? (Hear, hear.)<sup>29</sup>

MR. ROBINSON did not state, but proceeded to present several other petitions, one of them from the Municipal Council of Essa, praying the House to prohibit the sale and manufacture of Spirits.<sup>30</sup>

(6)

*The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--*

*By Mr. Mackenzie,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Haldimand; the Petition of the Municipality of the Townships of Moulton and Sherbrooke; and the Petition of Duncan McEachern of Dunwich.*

*By Mr. Hartman,--Two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of York and Peel.*

*By the Honorable Mr. Robinson,--Six Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Essa, County of Simcoe.*

*By Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion,--The Petition of John Bothwell and others, of the Township of Durham.*

(7)

*By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of Ephraim Doolittle and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland.*

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*The House adjourned until Monday next.<sup>31</sup>*

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: EXPENSES RELATING TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. LORANGER [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a statement of all expenses incurred by the Province, whether paid or unpaid, for removing the public offices and all public officers and servants from Quebec to Toronto, whether for freight, cartage, or indemnity; of all expenses incurred in the several public offices and Parliament buildings since 1st October last, for new furniture or repairs to furniture; of all expenses incurred in repairs, alterations, or additions made to the several buildings occupied as public offices, Parliament buildings and Governor's residence; of the amount paid or payable for the several buildings used as public offices, and an estimate of the expenses to be incurred resulting from the conditions of such leases; the said statement showing all the expenses incurred by the Province in consequence of the late removal of the Seat of Government from the City of Quebec to the City of Toronto.<sup>32</sup>

1. Some newspapers introduce this new Session by providing a descriptive commentary on the Parliamentary buildings and premises in Toronto. WESTERN PLANET, 28 February 1856, contains a "few words about the Houses of Parliament as they are since the recent changes which have been made to adapt them for the increased number of Parliamentary members. The original Parliamentary buildings consisted of three brick blocks, separated from each other; the centre containing the two chambers, and the side buildings the offices for Clerks, &c. When the seat of Government was transferred to Toronto in 1849, the spaces between the side buildings and the central, were filled up with wooden erections. These have now been replaced by brick, and two wings have been added behind. No alteration has been made in the Chamber of the Legislative Council; but in the Legislative Assembly Chamber the old gallery has been carried nearly round the House, except in that part which is pierced for windows. The whole seems to have been refitted and, ... no expense has been spared".

Another comment is reported in GLOBE, 16 February 1856, as follows: "The preparations at the Parliament Buildings were going on up to the last hour, the workmen having scarcely cleared out, when the time arrived for the ceremonies to commence.... Increased room has been found for the members of the House of Assembly by encroaching on the space formerly allotted to the public, the floor being now occupied by members' seats, except a few benches at the west entrance for members of the Legislative Council and other privileged visitors. The furniture is mostly the same as was in use last session in Quebec. The gallery on the north side of the Hall is set apart for the ladies, who are thus brought within view of the opposition members, a privilege which last session was exclusively enjoyed by the occupants of the Ministerial Benches. Reporters' galleries are erected on the north-east, and south-east corners, on each side of the Speaker's chair. Their position is unfortunately not very well adapted for hearing, and the gentlemen of the Press accordingly seem to be somewhat dissatisfied with the arrangement. The western gallery has been enlarged by the addition of several rows of seats in front, and is intended for the accommodation of the general public. The old library on the second floor has been fitted up as the reading room for the House of Assembly, and above that is the 'tabacie,' (sic) or smoking room, where the 'Comité de la Pipe' will meet to discuss the affairs of State, free from the formalities which rule the House below. The Legislative Council Chamber, situated to the west of the principal entrance to the building, has been very elegantly and tastefully fitted up, the upholstery and furniture being nearly all new. The reading-room is immediately adjoining, as also the Speaker's apartments, on which latter every expense that taste could suggest, has been freely lavished, as they will be made use of by His Excellency and Lady Head, when they occasionally visit the building. The library now occupies the two new wings at the back, but it is feared that the space will be insufficient for the reception of all the books, a large additional number having recently been brought from Europe by the Assistant Librarian, Mr. Todd."

Of interest is also a commentary describing the seating arrangements in the House of Assembly, reported by TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856: "A large number of the members have not yet arrived, but the front seats are nearly all filled up. On the Ministerial side, Mr. Solicitor General Smith occupies the single desk next to the Speaker, Sir Allan MacNab and the Attorney General Drummond occupy the adjoining desk, then Hon. Mr. Cartier, and Hon. Mr. Lemieux,

Mr. James Smith and Hon. J.C. Morrison, and Mr. Sydney Smith. In the second row and immediately behind the Premier sat the Hon. Mr. Cauchon and Hon. Mr. Spence, Hon. J.A. McDonald, and Hon. Mr. Cayley. At the upper end, on the Opposition side, is Mr. DeWitt's desk vacant--then Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Dorion of Montreal, Hon. J.S. Macdonald, and Mr. George Brown, then Mr. Gamble and Hon. J.H. Cameron, then Mr. Rankin and Mr. Larwell. Our other City Member, Mr. Bowes, occupies one of the desks immediately in front of the Speaker. The Hall is very commodiously seated for the Members, while the space formerly appropriated to strangers, now monopolized by the additional requirements of the House, is more than compensated for by the gallery which has been erected on the north side of the building. Both galleries were crowded at the opening, and so many tickets had been issued to gentlemen to witness the ceremony in the Upper House, that at least a hundred of them stood with their tickets in hand, [a]waiting the opening of the door for their admission, and did not know until all was over and His Excellency drove off, that the members were all taken in by a side door and that the proceedings were all over. Many of them felt it to be rather a disappointment."

HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 20 February 1856, also provides a descriptive commentary on the opening of parliament.

2. GLOBE, 16 February 1856.
3. IBID.
4. MORNING CHRONICLE, 16 February 1856, in a commentary, notes that "a telegraphic report of the Speech from the Throne was received in Quebec about 4 o'clock P.M. This is very quick work, making every allowance for the difference of time, if it be strictly correct, as without doubt it is, that His Excellency proceeded to the Legislative Chambers at half-past 3."
5. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856, provides the following information: "About five minutes past four o'clock, the Speaker took the Chair, and the members present having got into position."
6. GLOBE, 16 February 1856, reports a slightly different version from the JOURNALS, as follows: "The Speaker stated that there was a vacancy in the representation of the city of Quebec, caused by the Hon. Mr. Chabot being appointed to an office of emolument by the Government, and that the parties who had contested Mr. Chabot's seat had withdrawn their opposition. In the circumstances, however, he had not thought it proper to issue a writ, until the House met."
7. GLOBE, 16 February 1856.
8. IBID.
9. IBID.
10. GLOBE, 16 February 1856, adds: "The second reading being fixed for this day fortnight."
11. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856.
12. GLOBE, 16 February 1856, specifies that "the Speaker read the Speech which had been delivered by His Excellency, in French and in English, the members standing while it was read." Commentaries on the Speech from the Throne are found in another column of GLOBE, 16 February 1856, and also in: MORNING CHRONICLE, 16 February 1856; MONTREAL GAZETTE, 16 February 1856; MONTREAL GAZETTE, 18 February 1856; GLOBE, 18 February 1856; WESTERN PLANET, 28 February 1856; and GLOBE, 3 March 1856.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856.
14. IBID.
15. IBID.

16. GLOBE, 16 February 1856.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856.
18. IBID.
19. IBID.
20. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856, comments that "the delay was evidently assented to by the Government, with a view to accommodate the Opposition, and the understanding certainly was, that no second postponement could reasonably be asked for."
21. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 16 February 1856.
22. IBID.
23. GLOBE, 16 February 1856.
24. IBID.
25. IBID.
26. IBID.
27. GLOBE, 16 February 1856. This newspaper provides a commentary on Sectarian Schools, part of which reads as follows: "Mr. Hartman opened the contest on the Separate School question by presenting the petition of the Council of York and Peel.... He obtained leave to read it and while doing so with emphasis, was eagerly listened to by the House, and by the crowd in the galleries. He was frequently interrupted by hear, hears, from the members, and at the close of the sentence recommending the entire abolition of Sectarian Schools, there was loud applause from all parts of the House, in which we are not certain that a portion of the galleries did not join. Afterwards, when Mr. Robinson of South Simcoe, presented a petition of like import, there was a similar burst, apparently joined in even by those in the neighbourhood of the Ministerial benches."
28. GLOBE, 16 February 1856.
29. IBID.
30. IBID.
31. GLOBE, 16 February 1856, notes that "the House then adjourned till 3 P.M. on Monday."
32. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856. This newspaper mistakenly inserts this notice of motion in its report of the notices presented on the 19th February 1856. Although it informs that Mr. Loranger will move the Address on "Wednesday next", the Address is moved and ordered on Monday, 18 February 1856.

MONDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 1856.<sup>1</sup>

(7)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Jobin,--The Petition of the Reverend L. Guyon, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Ste. Elizabeth; two Petitions of the Reverend J.B. St. Germain, Curé, of the Parish of St. Laurent, Island of Montreal; and the Petition of Joseph Allard and others.

By Mr. Papin,--The Petition of the Mechanics' Institute and Library Association of Lanoraie; and the Petition of the Corporation of the College of L'Assomption.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of T.N. Ball and others, inhabitants of the Township of Thorold, County of Welland.

By Mr. Charles Daoust,--The Petition of the Institut Canadien of Montreal.

By Mr. Powell,--Four Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton.

MR. POWELL presented several petitions from the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton. One of them prayed the Legislature to cause a survey to be made to ascertain the cost of a canal uniting the waters of the Georgian Bay with the St. Lawrence by the Ottawa route. Another prayed the Legislature to pass a stringent Prohibitory Liquor Law. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member stated that he did not concur in that petition. A third petition prayed the Legislature to make the same provision for the payment of Jurors in Upper Canada, as was provided by the Act of last Session for the payment of Jurors in Lower Canada.<sup>2</sup>--Also a petition for the Ottawa Railway<sup>3</sup>.

(7)

By Mr. Angus Morrison,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe.

By the Honorable Mr. Cameron,--The Petition of Ogle R. Gowan, of the City of Toronto, Grand Master of the Orange Association, and others.

By Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion,--The Petition of Sister M.J. Hainault dite Deschamps and others, Sisters of Charity, in charge of the General Hospital in the City of Montreal; the Petition of Louis Leclaire and others, of the City of Montreal; and the Petition of G.H. Ryland, Vice-President, and Thomas Austin, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association of Registrars in Lower Canada.

By the Honorable Mr. Young,--The Petition of Jacques Viger, President, and the Very Reverend A.F. Truteau, Secretary, on behalf of the Association of the School of St. Jacques, Montreal; and the Petition of the Quebec Board of Trade.<sup>4</sup>

By Mr. Evanturel,--The Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City of Quebec.

By Mr. Loranger,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Parish of St. Martin, County of Laval; the Petition of Michel Bibaud; the Petition of William W. Fisher and others, of the Parish of St. Bernard de Lacolle, County of St. John; and the Petition of the Reverend J.D. Laporte and others, School Commissioners and others, of the Parish of St. Ambroise de Kildare, County of Joliette.

By Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion,--The Petition of Hilaire Allard and others, of the Village of L'Avenir;

MR. J. DORION (Drummond) presented the petition of Hilaire Allard and others, of the village of L'Avenir, representing that it was of importance, in order to secure the public liberties of Canada, that the different branches of the Government

be made directly responsible to the people. They prayed, therefore, that the Legislative Council be made elective. They also asked that an address be presented to the Imperial Authorities, calling for the necessary changes in our Constitution, so as to render the office of Governor elective by the people of Canada.--They represented further, that Sir Edmund Head, by the injurious and offensive language which he recently held towards the French population of the country, and by the more than injudicious comparison which he chose to institute between the French and the Saxon races, has proved, that he is incompetent for the government of such a country as ours, because his conduct, in place of tending to create harmony and good feeling between the different races who inhabit it, was one calculated to excite national animosities, which must exercise a disastrous influence on the destinies of Canada. For these reasons, the petitioners asked, that Sir Edmund Head be re-called to England, and that the people be enabled to choose their own Governor, and at the same time, to give him a salary more proportioned to the resources of the country, than that received by the Governor now in office.<sup>5</sup>

(7)

*the Petition of Edouard Bourassa and others, of the Village of L'Avenir; and the Petition of Charles Charpentier and others, of the Village of L'Avenir.*

*By Mr. Brodeur,--The Petition of Sister Marie St. Maurice Borgel, Superior of the Sisters of the Presentation of Mary, at St. Hugues, County of Bagot.*

*By Mr. Bell,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lanark and Renfrew.*

(8)

*Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Haldimand; praying for certain amendments to the Law for imposing Statute Labor.*

*Of the Municipality of the Townships of Moulton and Sherbrooke; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway Company, to lease their Road,--and also for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.*

*Of Duncan McEachern, of Dunwich; setting forth certain grievances, and praying inquiry into the same.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of York and Peel; praying for the passing of an Act repealing all legal provisions for the establishment of Separate Schools.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of York and Peel; praying for the passing of an Act to revise and consolidate the Municipal Law of this Province.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying for an amendment to the Act 7 Will. 4, cap. 10.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying that provision may be made for the erection of a Provincial Asylum for the reception of Idiots.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; and of the Municipality of the Township of Essa, County of Simcoe; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying for certain amendments to the Charter of the Ontario, Simcoe, and Huron Union Railroad Company.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying that measures may be adopted for establishing an International Trade between the British West India Islands and this Province.*

*Of John Bothwell and others, of the Township of Durham; praying that the Act passed last Session to alter the tenure of Indian Land in the Township of Durham, may be amended.*

*Of Ephraim Doolittle and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; praying for the passing of an Act vesting in Ephraim Doolittle and Robert Johnston certain un-opened road allowances in the said Township.*

[On motion of] MR. HARTMAN, seconded by MR. AIKINS,<sup>6</sup>

(8)

*Ordered, That the Petition of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of York and Peel, relative to Separate Schools, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.*

MR. LORANGER moved that an address be presented to his Excellency, for a statement of the expenses incurred by the removal of the seat of Government from Quebec to Toronto.<sup>7</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said he had no objection to the motion being adopted, but no reply could be received to the address, until an answer was given to the Governor's Speech.<sup>8</sup>

The motion was then adopted.<sup>9</sup>

(8)

*On motion of Mr. Loranger, seconded by Mr. Rankin,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, requesting that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Statement of all expenses incurred by the Province, whether paid or unpaid, for removing the Public Offices and all Public Officers and Servants, from Quebec to Toronto, whether for freight, cartage or indemnity; of all expenses incurred in the several Public Offices and Parliament Buildings, since the first of October last, for new furniture or repairs to furniture; of all expenses incurred in repairs, alterations or additions made to the several buildings occupied as Public Offices, Parliament buildings, and Governor's residence, of the amount of rent paid or payable for the several buildings used as Public Offices, and an estimate of the expenses to be incurred resulting from the conditions of such leases; the said Statement containing generally a mention of all the expenses whatever incurred by*

(9)

*the Province, in consequence of the late removal of the Seat of Government from the City of Quebec to the City of Toronto.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB moved that a Select Committee of thirteen members be appointed to prepare and report the lists of Standing Committees ordered by the House--to be composed of the Hon. Sir A.N. Macnab, the Hon. Mr. Drummond, Mr. DeWitt, the Hon. J.S. Macdonald, the Hon. Mr. Cartier, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, the Hon. Mr. Merritt, and Messrs. Morrison, (of Niagara,) Loranger, Whitney, Southwick, Dorion, (of Montreal,) and Flint.<sup>10</sup>

MR. A. DORION, (Montreal,) suggested that the name of Hon. Mr. Young be substituted for that of Mr. DeWitt, who was not expected in Toronto for some time.<sup>11</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said that he had no objection to it,<sup>12</sup> and the motion passed.<sup>13</sup>

(9)

*Resolved, That a Select Committee of thirteen Members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by this House, and that the said Committee be composed of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, the Honorable Mr. Young, the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, the Honorable Mr. Cartier, the Honorable Mr. Cameron, the Honorable Mr. Merritt, Mr. Joseph C. Morrison, Mr. Loranger, Mr. Whitney, Mr. Southwick, Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, and Mr. Flint.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion have leave to bring in a Bill to change the tenure of the Indian lands in the Township of Durham.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time, on Monday, the twenty-fifth instant.*

*Mr. Speaker communicated to the House, a Report of the Librarian of the Legislative Assembly on the state of the Joint Library of Parliament, which is as followeth:--*

*To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of Canada.*

*The Librarian, on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, of the Joint Library of Parliament, begs leave respectfully to Report:--*

*That the Joint Library Committee of both Houses of the Legislature having, during the last Session of Parliament, agreed to the adoption of measures for reorganizing the Library of Parliament, upon a practical and useful scale, determined upon sending to Europe a special agent for the selection and purchase of books in London and Paris, in the various departments of law, politics, literature and science, agreeably to instructions prepared by the Honorable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and by the Chairman of the Library Committee.*

*Being intrusted by the Committee with this duty, and having been furnished by His Excellency the Governor General with letters commendatory to the Colonial Office in London, I left Quebec upon my mission, on the 31st May last.*

*In the general instructions given by the Committee for my guidance, I was authorised to make application to the Offices of State in England and France, for donations of such works at the disposal of the respective Governments, as they might think fit to present to the Library. I was also empowered to receive from Public Institutions and from private individuals, any donations of books that might be offered, with directions to report specially thereon to the Legislature, in order that all such gifts should be suitably acknowledged.*

*Shortly after my arrival in London, I presented my credentials at the Colonial Office, and being honoured with an interview by the late lamented Right Honorable Sir William Molesworth, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, communicated to him the nature of my mission and the hopes entertained by the Provincial Authorities that some assistance would be afforded by the Imperial Government in the endeavour to collect together a Library for Canada, suited to the wants of the Legislature, and calculated to afford the means of information to students and practical men in our rapidly improving Province.*

*Sir William Molesworth* gave me assurance of his desire to afford me every aid and facility in his power to further the objects of my mission. By his order, I was afterwards furnished with a list of the various Departments of the British

(10)

Government which had been requested to contribute their official publications to the Library, and with directions to put myself in communication with them for the purpose of receiving any works which it might be in the power of Her Majesty's Government to bestow.

The Offices enumerated in my letter from the Colonial Office were the following, viz:--

The Admiralty,  
The Board of Ordnance,  
The Board of Trade,  
The Board of Health,  
The Treasury,  
The Rolls House,  
The Foreign Office, and  
The British Museum.

I will now proceed to state the result of my applications to these several Offices.

From the Secretary to the Board of Admiralty, I received a most valuable collection of Maps and Charts of all parts of the Globe, selected by the Hydrographer of the Admiralty for the use of the Library. These I afterwards caused to be carefully arranged, mounted upon linen, and bound in twenty-three large folio volumes. From this Department I was also presented with fifty-four volumes of Sailing Directions, and other official publications of the Board.

From the Board of Ordnance, I was presented with the entire series, so far as has yet been published, of the Maps of the Ordnance Survey of the several Counties of England, Scotland and Ireland. The magnificent scale upon which this work has been executed is that of one inch to a mile. It already extends to 2,736 separate sheets, and it is still far from completion. The cost of these maps, if bought at the publisher's, would exceed 470L sterling. Feeling that this series from its vast extent, would be quite unmanageable for reference, unless suitably arranged, and would be liable to injury if not properly preserved, I have caused the sheets to be mounted on linen, and classified according to Counties, and have directed presses to be made, with sliding shelves, each marked by a descriptive letter piece, in order to insure the preservation of this important collection, and to afford every facility to those who may desire to refer to it.

By the Secretary of the Board of Trade, I was presented with the official publications of that Department, comprising a valuable series of Statistical Tables of Great Britain and its dependencies, from 1820 to 1853, in forty-six volumes, and with various works emanating from the Museum of Practical Geology, and presented by Sir Roderick Murchison, Director General of that Institution.

The Board of Health presented me with copies of all their official publications. These works, though few in number, and mostly included in the annual series of the Sessional Papers of the House of Commons, are, nevertheless, very important, and form a consecutive series of much interest in sanitary investigations.

My application at the Treasury was met, at the outset, with a difficulty arising out of certain regulations which the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury had found it needful to establish with regard to the disposal of works published at the public expense, including the Ordnance Maps, the publications of the Record Commission, and

State Papers, forbidding the gratuitous presentation of these works in future; nevertheless, after an interview (sic) with James Wilson, Esquire, M.P., one of the Secretaries of the Treasury, and in consequence of the strong recommendations in favour of the Library by the Colonial Secretary, Sir C.E. Trevelyan wrote to the Colonial Office, under date of the 17th October, 1855, in the following terms:-- "While the Lords of the Treasury would feel bound, in all ordinary cases, to abide by those regulations, they regarded the circumstances affecting the present application as justifying them in making an exception in favour of the Canadian Legisla-

(11)

ture, and in lending their aid to make good the losses sustained in the destruction of a large portion of the Public Library of the Province of Canada, during the Fire at the Parliament Buildings in Quebec, in February, 1854, by presenting to the Houses of the Legislature the copies of any Works which have been published under the direction of the Government, and are still in its possession.

"If Sir William Molesworth will place Mr. Todd, the gentleman deputed for this purpose by the Legislature of Canada, in communication with this Board, My Lords will have proper arrangements made for carrying out these intentions."

I was accordingly put into communication with W.M. Stephenson, Esquire, Principal Clerk Assistant to the Secretaries of the Treasury, who manifested a lively interest in the matter, and kindly undertook to ascertain, from the several Offices in connection with the Treasury, what they had it in their power to bestow, in order that their contributions might be made as complete as possible. Afterwards, I received a letter from Sir C.E. Trevelyan, dated 13th November, 1855, enclosing lists of scientific and other works, and of Record Publications, deposited in the Government stores, and informing me that the Master of the Rolls, and the Comptroller of the Stationery Office, were prepared to furnish me on application, with any of the works mentioned in these lists, which might be desirable to obtain for the Library.

The active exertions of Mr. Stephenson in our behalf, led however, to our receiving still larger contributions than would otherwise have been given. Through his instrumentality, I obtained from the Rolls House, all the publications of the Record Commission of Great Britain remaining in print; in one or two instances, the sole remaining copy in store being presented. Through my introduction from the Colonial Office, I had been furnished with a list of works from the Public Record Department, which they were willing to supply, but in the subsequent letter from Sir C.E. Trevelyan, that list was materially enlarged.

While on this subject, I may add, that I succeeded in procuring from various London booksellers, nearly all the volumes of the Records which the Rolls Office were unable to supply, so that we now possess a set very nearly complete of these important historical publications.

On applying at Her Majesty's Stationery Office, after the receipt of Sir Charles Trevelyan's letter, I received the interesting series of Historical Records of the different Regiments of the British Army, in 68 volumes, together with some Army manuals, and several valuable scientific works; a list of which will be found in the Appendix to this Report.

On writing to the Foreign Office, I received a reply, dated 19th November, 1855, from Lord Wodehouse, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, presenting to the Library a set of the British and Foreign State Papers, from 1812 to 1837, (in 25 volumes,) a collection of the Bulletins of State Intelligence, being an abstract of the most important articles in the Official Gazette, from 1793 to 1853, (in 61 volumes,) together with 8 volumes of Papers relating to State affairs between Great Britain and Foreign countries.

At the British Museum, I was most courteously received by Sir Henry Ellis, the principal Librarian, and was presented with a small but valuable collection of books, printed by authority of the Trustees.

Soon after my arrival in England, I applied to J.G. Shaw Lefevre, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Lords, in order to obtain a copy of the Lord's Journals, to replace the set destroyed at the Fire in Quebec, and to inquire about a set of the Sessional Papers of the House of Lords which had been promised us so long ago as 1852, when Mr. Faribault was sent to England, but which had never been forwarded to the Library. Parliament being then in Session, Mr. Lefevre undertook to have my application formally communicated to their Lordships, and shortly after he transmitted to me the following Order passed by the House on the 10th August, 1855:--Ordered, "That

(12)

a set of the printed Papers of the House of Lords, and Printed Minutes of their Proceedings, from the earliest period that the same can be made up, to the present time, be furnished to the Library of the Parliament of Canada; and that in future the Parliamentary Papers, and Parliamentary Minutes of each Session be also supplied to the said Library." The collection furnished under this Order included the Lords' Journals complete to the present time, in 100 volumes, and the Lords' Papers from 1790 to 1854, in 1200 volumes.

Through the kindness of Thomas Vardon, Esquire, Librarian to the House of Commons, I was presented with all the volumes of Sessional Papers of the House of Commons required to complete our series of this most useful and important work. After the loss sustained in the destruction of our former collection of these documents, orders had been given to our London Agent to purchase any number of volumes of the Commons' Papers that might occur for sale. He had succeeded in buying a set for the year 1823 and from 1826 to 1843. All the previous volumes, from 1806 to 1822, those for 1824 and 1825, and from 1844 to 1850, in all about 750 volumes, were obtained for us by Mr. Vardon, who manifested on all occasions, his desire to further the interests of the Library, and who afforded me much assistance by the use he permitted me to make of the Catalogue of the fine collection under his charge.

I have thus stated in order, the result of my application to the several Offices of State to which my letters from the Colonial Office gave me introduction and access. Before leaving this subject, however, I desire to make public acknowledgement of the benefit I derived from the good offices of George Mayer, Esquire, the Librarian and Keeper of the Records of the Colonial Department. The kind assistance of this gentleman to Messrs. Faribault and Wicksteed, when on a similar mission in 1852, received honorable mention from them, and was acknowledged by Resolutions in Parliament, at the time. On the occasion of my visit to London, Mr. Mayer was prompt to afford me every counsel and aid that his experience and official position could suggest, and I feel that I am largely indebted to his active zeal and judicious advice, for the great success which attended my applications to the Imperial Offices of State, on behalf of the Library.

My attention having been directed to the valuable and comprehensive publications now issuing from the Office of the Commissioners of Patents for Inventions, I was induced to write to the Clerk of Patents, L. Edmonds, Esquire, to solicit from the Commissioners a donation of these important works; being persuaded that they would be found most useful in the Canadian community, where practical arts and inventions are daily becoming more developed and appreciated. I afterwards waited upon Bennet Woodcroft, Esquire, the Superintendent of Specifications, &c., under whose fostering care the several publications of this Office have been planned, arranged,

and executed. By the joint liberality of these gentlemen, to whom the Commissioners have entrusted authority for the purpose, the entire series of the publications of the Department, (and which will be found enumerated in the Appendix) were placed unreservedly at my disposal for the use of the Library, and directions given for the periodical delivery to our London Agent, of the Specifications and Reports to be hereafter issued from this Office. The several works included in this munificent donation amount in all to upwards of 100 volumes of letter-press, and 50 folio volumes of plates, the latter embracing designs and working drawings of Patents for Inventions, of every description, from an early period to the present day.

I have further to record an act of liberality on the part of Mr. Woodcroft, towards the Province, which is deserving of public acknowledgment. Having made inquiries of me with regard to the state of the Patent law in Canada, and the progress made in recording descriptions of Inventions sought to be patented amongst us,

(13)

he volunteered to present the Canadian Patent Office with a collection similar to that given to the Library, on condition of his being supplied with certain information concerning Canadian Patents, and the Law affecting the same, and of his being assured that the public should have free access at all reasonable hours, to the books and plans he should supply. I lost no time in communicating this handsome offer to the Provincial Department, and before leaving England had the satisfaction of receiving from the Imperial Patent Office another complete series of these valuable publications, on behalf of the Province, to be deposited in the Office under the charge of Mr. Hutton, Secretary of the Board of Statistics. The books are now in the hands of Mr. Rich, our London Agent, awaiting directions from the Provincial Authorities with regard to their binding. The copy presented to the Library, I have directed to be suitably bound, and the immense collection of plates to be mounted upon stout cartridge paper. The cost of this will be considerable, from the very magnitude of the work, but I deemed it to be indispensably necessary to incur any needful expense, to render this important series available for reference, and to preserve it from the effects of use. The plans and drawings are published upon very thin paper, and must be mounted at once if they are to be subjected to much consultation. The directions I have given for the binding of the Library copy, are similar to those which have emanated from the Library of Congress, and other similar Institutions possessing a copy of this work.

Taking advantage of the opportunity of my being in London, I addressed a letter to Sir James Melvill, Secretary of the Honorable the East India Company, soliciting the donation of any works issued under the patronage of the Company, having reference to the development of the resources of India, and to the language and literature of that country. In his answer, dated 8th November, 1855, Sir James, after mentioning that he had laid my communication before the Court of Directors, proceeded to state, that "In reply I am commanded to inform you that the Court will be happy to forward your object as far as lies in their power, and that a list of the works which would be suitable for the Library of Canada, and of which copies are available, is now in course of preparation, under their orders." Up to the time of leaving London these books had not reached me; but shortly before my departure, I wrote to the Assistant Secretary of the Company, requesting that, when ready, they might be forwarded to Mr. Rich, who was authorized to receive them for the Library. Whereupon, I was assured that the books should be sent to Mr. Rich as soon as possible; but that the list of the same had not yet been completed.

Having been instructed by the Library Committee to procure versions of the Bible in the various European tongues, as auxiliary to the study of those languages, I

applied to the British and Foreign Bible Society, for a selection of the versions of the Holy Scriptures issued by that body. The Society readily acceded to my request, informing me that they would be able to make up 90 or 100 volumes of this description; and at the same time, expressing a hope that their gift "might be the means of drawing attention to the important and extensive operations carried on by the Bible Society."

I also applied to the Oriental Translation Fund Society, for a copy of their interesting publications, which comprise some of the most curious works extant in Eastern Literature. I received a very kind reply from the Secretary, dated 22nd of December, informing me that he would submit my letter to the Committee at their next monthly meeting, but adding, "at the same time I fear that I do not anticipate that the Society will be able to grant the books entirely as a free gift or grant. But they will possibly offer them to you at a very considerable reduction, i.e. half price. I trust that this proposal will meet your wishes. The Institution is maintained in its efforts by the munificence of individuals, and therefore does not make

(14)

free grants of their works, except in cases where there are no means of bearing any part of the expenses of their publication."

Similar applications to the Secretary of the Royal Society, and to the Librarian of the Royal Institution for the advancement of Science, with a view to obtain donations of the published Transactions of the leading Scientific Societies, were attended with less favorable results. I was informed, that these learned bodies made it a rule to present their transactions to kindred Institutions only, by way of exchange for similar works; and that they felt bound to reserve their free grant of books for the benefit of poor Societies or Institutions who were unable to incur the expense of purchasing the same.

Failing in my endeavour to obtain, without cost to the Library, any of these important collections, so indispensable to aid the researches of the student in scientific inquiries, I made every effort to purchase series, as complete as possible, of the publications of the leading learned Societies of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and was fortunately able to effect this, to a great extent, and at a comparatively small expense.

The donations to the Library from private sources were few in number; my official position not admitting of general applications of this kind. The names of those gentlemen to whom the Library is indebted for the presentation of books, will be found in the Appendix to this Report. I would beg, however, to make special mention of a contribution received from Mr. Vincent Brooks, the well known lithographic artist and printer, towards the formation of a small series I have collected, illustrative of the progress of the art of printing in oils and chromo-lithography. Having selected, from two of the principal houses engaged in such publications, a few specimens towards the formation of a portfolio on these subjects, I called upon Mr. Vincent Brooks, whose productions undoubtedly excel anything of the kind elsewhere attempted. Having mentioned my object, and that I was purchasing for the Library of the Parliament of Canada, Mr. Brooks very liberally presented me with several of his best specimens, including one of peculiar excellence. This is a copy of the "Lumley Portrait" of Shak[e]speare, which, by a process of printing, involving twenty-three distinct impressions, presents in appearance and colour, a facsimile of an old oil painting, so exact as not to be detected from an original oil painting by any ordinary observer. Mr. Brooks is in the employ of the Government Department of Science and Art at Marlborough House; and he has recently been awarded a gold medal at the Paris Exposition.

So soon as the nature of my engagements in London permitted, I proceeded to Paris. To enable me to make formal application to the Departments of State in France, on behalf of the Library, I was entrusted by the Right Honorable Sir William Molesworth, and by the Earl of Clarendon, with letters to Lord Cowley, Her Majesty's Minister at Paris. Upon presenting these letters at the British Embassy, I was courteously received by His Excellency the British Ambassador, who gave me a letter of introduction to the Imperial Minister for Foreign Affairs, Count Walewski. He moreover undertook to see Count Walewski personally upon the subject, and to solicit from him the most favorable response that it might be in the power of the French Government to afford, to the recommendations of the British Authorities. But I need scarcely add, that such is the cordial feeling now happily existing in France towards this Country, that it did not require the kind intervention of Lord Cowley to induce the Imperial Government to act towards Canada with its wonted generosity. Everywhere, in all the Bureaux of State, my applications on behalf of the Library were received with favour and responded to with liberality. I regret that it is not in my power, at present, to go more fully into particulars. Statements promised by M. Bossange, our Agent in Paris, of all the Donations transmitted to him from the several French Departments, have not yet reached me. I am enabled to state,

(15)

however, that M. le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique et des Cultes, has sent upwards of 160 volumes, including the very valuable Documens inédits sur l'histoire de France, in 65 volumes. From M. le Ministre de la Marine has been received about 120 volumes, embracing the accounts of the principal Government exploratory and scientific voyages. From M. le Ministre de la Guerre, has been received a copy of the splendid Carte de France, large Atlases of different parts of Europe, and of the French possessions in Africa; together with other works of much interest. Other Departments of State have pledged themselves to contribute to the Library, but their donations had not been sent in when I last heard from Paris.

I will now advert to that part of my mission which concerned the purchase of books. The sum entrusted to me for this purpose was 9,621L 9s. 6d., sterling, which was placed to my credit by the Receiver General of the Province, in the Bank of Messieurs Glyn, Mills, & Company, London. By the direction of the Library Committee, one-half of this amount was to be expended upon English books, and the remaining moiety upon French works, including also, a selection of works upon languages, and in Foreign tongues.

The purchases were to be effected under general instructions framed by the Library Committee, specifying the classes of literature to which preference was to be given, while every class should be more or less represented.

With a view to obtain some assistance in the difficult task entrusted to me, of choosing the books required for the Library, while at New York, on the way to England, I waited upon Dr. Cogswell, the learned and indefatigable Superintendent of the Astor Library, and by whose labours that admirable collection has been formed. Within a recent period, Dr. Cogswell has twice or thrice visited Europe on behalf of the Library, and his extensive knowledge of books, and pains-taking activity, enabled him to effect his purchases upon highly favourable terms. I was, therefore, induced to apply to him for information to direct my own endeavours. The learned Doctor readily responded to my request, and communicated to me many valuable hints and suggestions for my future guidance.

In London, I was aided by the experience of Mr. George Rich, of the firm of Rich, Brothers, Booksellers, so long favourably known as Agents for the Library. His services were most useful, and were always cheerfully rendered. From

Mr. Henry G. Bohn, the well-known London publisher, I also derived much valuable aid. He holds the largest stock of books in London, and is remarkable for the extent and accuracy of his bibliographical information. The choicest portion of our English books, and several of the most valuable French works, were selected from his stock, which is noted for completeness in historical collections, and in works illustrative of the Fine Arts.

In Paris, I had the benefit of the experience and information of M. Hector Bossange, the leading bookseller of that city. Most Canadians who have visited France at this season have had proof of the urbanity and kindness of M. Bossange, who, having formerly resided in Canada, has never ceased to take a lively interest in its welfare, and to endeavour, by every means in his power, to render good service to the province; as his exertions on behalf of Canada, at the recent French Exposition, will testify. To myself, he afforded the most valuable aid. Aware of my deficiencies in a knowledge of the language and literature of France, M. Bossange spared no pains to supply my defects, and to render the French portion of the Library creditable and complete. He obtained for me the friendly assistance of M. de Puibusque, a learned Professor, who is well-known and appreciated in Canada. Mr. Taché, the Provincial Commissioner to the Paris Exposition, Mr. Hunt, of the Geological Survey, and other gentlemen from Canada, also contributed information and advice in the choice of the most suitable works for the French portion of the Library.

(16)

When it became necessary for me to prefer my applications to the various Departments of State, in Paris, for donations from the French Government, M. Bossange's services were of the greatest utility. He accompanied me in my visits to the Bureaux; on my return to London, he waited repeatedly upon the several Officers of State, to ensure the due fulfilment of the generous assurances of the French Ministers, that directions should be given to all the Departments to contribute as liberally as possible towards the Canadian Library. In every respect, I am bound to acknowledge that if the expectations of the Legislature, with regard to the French portion of the Library, have been satisfied, the credit is mainly, if not altogether, due to M. Bossange.

Notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts to complete my labours at an earlier day, the length of time required to further the applications to the Governments of England and France, for donations, the necessity for informing myself, by frequent visits to leading public and official Libraries, as to the most desirable works to select for the Library, and the time necessarily taken up in the book market, prevented my return to Canada until the beginning of January. Even then I had been unable to expend the whole of the moneys in my hands; but the near approach of the meeting of Parliament rendered my return imperative.

The books purchased in London and Paris have been all substantially bound, upon very economical terms; and the greater portion of them have already arrived either at Toronto or at New York. The remainder, including the balance of the French purchases, which were unavoidably in a less forward state, for shipment, when I left Europe, may be expected within two or three months. Meanwhile, I am preparing, for immediate publication, for the use of the Members, a Catalogue of all my purchases, which, though it will necessarily be meagre in its description of the books, will be complete, and will include also the books previously in the Library.

Before closing this Report, I have thought that it might be gratifying to many were I to point out some of the special objects of interest and literary merit, which I have been enabled to collect; particularly as owing to delay in providing suitable accommodation for the Library, it has not been possible to open even those

cases of books which have reached Toronto. Reference has been already made to the series of Parliamentary papers, the Maps of the Ordnance Survey, and from the Board of Admiralty, the Public Records, the series of Patent Specifications, and other official publications obtained in England, and also to the munificent donations received from the Government of France; I would now call attention to a few of the most rare and curious works included in my purchases; premising, however, that the several classes of law, politics, science, and literature, have been fully represented by selections of the best and most recent publications, and of standard writers.

The whole of the undermentioned works were bought from Mr. H.G. Bohn, to whose information I am chiefly indebted for the descriptive notices:--

*The Chronicles of Great Britain and France, together with Lord Somers' Historical Tracts, and the Harleian Miscellany. 55 vols., 4to., uniformly bound.*

*This fine uniform series of our Pillars of History is now difficult to obtain.*

*Hearne's Works on early English History; comprising between twenty and thirty separate Monkish Chronicles and ancient Itineraries. 85 vols.*

*This is the rarest of our English Historical Collections, and very few Libraries contain the entire set. A large paper set was sold, some years since, for 500L, and no similar copy has since occurred. The present set cost 75L.*

*Publications of the British Historical Society. 27 vols.*

*This Society undertook to publish inedited monuments of British History, in*

*(17)*

*the manner of Hearne, but found the cost [to] exceed their subscriptions, and the Society became extinct. Their publications are very valuable, and as but few copies were printed, must soon become rare.*

*English Almanacks; a consecutive series, from 1717 to 1820. 104 vols.*

*Each volume seems to contain all the Almanacks of the year, some of which are famous in story, such as Partridge's, Poor Robin, Gadbury, &c. They contain much curious astrological information, in addition to their general historical interest.*

*General Dictionary, Historical and Critical, being a translation, with additions, of Bayle's Dictionary; by Bernard, Birch and Lockman. 10 vols. Biographia Britannica. 7 vols. folio. The same, enlarged by Kippis; vols. 1 to 5 (all published). In all 22 vols. folio, uniform.*

*This is a very complete and valuable series of the older Biographies, and is rarely found together and uniform.*

*Aristotle's Works; translated by Taylor: with his translation of the Books of Proclus, on the Theology of Plato; together 13 vols., 4to.*

*This celebrated translation of Aristotle was printed at the expense of Wm. Meredith, Esq., and cost many thousand pounds. Not 50 complete copies exist, as of two of the volumes scarcely that number were printed. There is no other translation of the greater portion of these works.*

*Silvestre, Paléographie Universelle. 2 vols. Atlas folio; with letter-press; translated into English, with corrections, by Sir Frederick Madden, K.H., Keeper of the Manuscripts in the British Museum.*

*This is the grandest work of modern times, as regards its particular subject, the age and character of Manuscripts. It exhibits the best*

examples of every age and country, and was got up, at a cost of nearly 20,000L, under the auspices of the French Government. Even the Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts are better done than previously in England. The plates are now the property of Mr. H.G. Bohn, who has re-produced the work even more carefully coloured than at first, and with the revised letter-press, at less than half its original price.

*Assemani Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae.* 13 vols. 4to.

This is a work of great importance, and very rare, especially the later volumes. The 13th is so rare that it was but lately known to bibliographers. The work contains the Liturgies of the Churches of the East and West, and has been very much inquired after of late years.

*Groevius et Gronovius: Thesauri Antiquitatum Romanarum Graecarum et Italicarum: with the Supplements of Sallangro and Polenus, the Lexicon Antiquitatum of Piliscus and Gruter's Inscriptionis.* 69 vols. folio.

This great body of Greek, Roman, and Italian Topography and Antiquities has always been in request among scholars, and used formerly to command a great price. The present copy cost 29L; Mr. Bohn remembers to have sold a copy, many years ago, for 200L.

*Canina, L'Architettura antica, Egiziana Graeca e Romanae.* 3 vols. folio, of plates, and 6 vols. 8vo. of letter-press.

This grand Architectural Collection, by Canina, is very comprehensive and complete. The present was the subscription copy of Sir John Rennie.

*D'Agincourt, Histoire de l'Art, par les monuments.* 6 vols. in 3, folio.

Though this admirable work is very well known to all the lovers of art, it

(18)

is chiefly through less perfect editions. It has been re-produced in Italy, Germany, and England, but much abridged, especially the English edition.

*Du Sommerard. Les Arts du Moyen Age: avec Album.* 6 vols. folio, of beautifully coloured plates, and 5 vols. letter-press.

This is a fine set of the most attractive work on the Decorations of the Middle Ages, ever published. Many of the objects illustrated have been dispersed, the remainder were sold to the French Government, and are deposited at the Hotel de Clugny. A copy of this work lately brought 120L, at auction, in London, being double the cost of the present copy.

*Musée Français: (Pictures of the Paintings in the Gallery of the Louvre, during the time of the Emperor Napoleon I.) Original edition.* 4 vols. folio. Singularly fine impressions, equal to proofs.

*Boquet, Recueil des Historiens de la Gaule.* 20 vols. folio.

I was so fortunate as to get a fine and complete copy of this rare and desirable work for 60 guineas, at an auction, in London. There was no perfect copy to be met with in Paris; and when it occurs it is very costly.

*Pugin, Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume,* 4to., superbly bound in Morocco, most elaborately tooled.

This work is a complete repertory of information upon the subject of Church ornament, decoration and costume; but I call attention to it on account of the binding, which is a perfect masterpiece, and cost its late possessor 20L: besides which he bought two copies of the work in quires,

at seven guineas each, that he might select the best impressions. I paid for the book (the binding included,) 9L.

*Ferrario, Costume antico e moderno Europa, Asia, Africa et America. 18 vols. 4to.; many hundred coloured plates.*

This is the most extensive book extant on Costume. Only about six complete copies are known in England, and it is believed that there are not so many in France. In America no other copy is known.

*Sibthorp. Flora Graeca Sibthorpiana: sive Plantarum rariorum Historia, quas in Provinciis aut Insulis Graeciae legit, investigavit et depingi curavit J. Sibthorp, &c. 10 vols. folio, containing 1000 beautifully coloured plates.*

This is the most costly and perfect Flora ever published in any country.

The getting up cost 30,000L. Only fifty copies were printed, at 250 guineas each, but not half the number were taken up by the subscribers. No complete setts have come to auction, but the first six volumes brought 80 guineas at a sale. The cost of this copy, complete, and handsomely bound, was 45L.

*Asiatic Researches; or Transactions of the Society instituted at Bengal for inquiring into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia. 19 vols. 4to. Calcutta, 1788--1821, and Serampore, 1825--1837.*

This book, owing to its being printed in India, and in very limited number, hardly ever occurs for sale. There is a twentieth volume, printed in 1837, but it was not to be met with in London.

*Catlin's American Indians. 2 vols. 365 plates coloured, like drawings.*

The engravings in this well-known work were not published in colours, and only twelve copies were so got up by the Artist. It took three years to produce these few sets, and he is not likely to undertake any more.

(19)

*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, from the commencement to 1850. 141 vols.*

In this fine series the transactions are abridged up to 1750, from that period they are given in full. Accompanying this collection will be found the Abstracts, published by the Society, of the principal papers from 1800 to 1854, inclusive, in four volumes.

*Philosophical Magazines; by Nicholson, Tilloch, Taylor and Phillips, and Brewster, from 1797 to 1848: in all 5 vols. 4to. and 128 vols. 8vo. neatly bound.*

This interesting series belonged to the late Dr. Pearson, the eminent Astronomer. It was purchased of Mr. Bohn for 13 guineas.

*Transactions and publications, from the commencement, of the following Learned Societies; among other similar series:--*

*Astronomical Society, 23 vols. 4to.*

*Geological Society, 12 vols. 4to.*

*Linnaean Society, 20 vols. 4to.*

*Zoological Society, 3 vols. 4to.*

*Royal Irish Academy, 23 vols. 4to.*

*Royal Society of Edinburgh, 20 vols. 4to.*

*Royal Asiatic Society, and Literary Society of Bombay, 6 vols. 4to.*

*Statistical Society, 19 vols. 8vo.*

*Cavendish Society, 16 vols. 8vo.*

*Reports of the British Association for the advancement of Science, 21 vols. 8vo.*

*Silliman's American Journal of Science, 60 vols. 8vo.*

*Palaeontographical Society*, 10 vols. 4to.

*Hakluyt Society*, 12 vols. 8vo.

The greater number of these series of Transactions, &c., were obtained from Mr. Bohn, others of different London Booksellers. Among my purchases in the Trade, generally, I would call attention to the following Works:

Brian Walton's *Sacra Polyglotta*, or version of the Holy Scriptures in Hebrew, Chaldaean, Syriac, Sanscrit, Ethiopic, and Persian, 6 vols. folio; with *Lexicon*, 2 vols. folio.

Collection of Pamphlets, chiefly political, relating to events of the last half century. This curious collection was made by an officer of the British Museum since deceased. It is in 250 volumes.

Collection of Tracts on American History, many of great rarity and value, (1738-1833,) with a series of Tracts respecting Canada, (1837-39.) In all 18 vols.

Rennie, (Sir John,) *Harbours of Great Britain: and Plymouth Breakwater*, 3 vols. folio. And some of the principal writers on modern Science, Architecture, Engineering, Railways, Manufactures, &c., and on Public Works in Europe and America.

N.B.--The non-arrival of expected letters from Paris prevents my giving a particular account of the most important works purchased of Mr. Bossange.

The number of books bought in Europe, (of which invoices are now in my hands,) including also, the donations actually received in England and France, amounts to 17,336 volumes. By the time the orders already given are executed, the number will probably exceed 20,000. It is estimated that about 10,000 volumes were in the Library of Parliament irrespective of these additions; the same having been securely removed from Quebec to Toronto under the superintendence of the Librarian of the Legislative Council.

(20)

The total expenditure for books and binding in Europe, including the cost of mounting the immense collection of Ordnance Maps and Admiralty Charts, before referred to, amounts to 7,555L 0s. 6d. sterling. I have prepared full statements of accounts, with vouchers for every payment, to be laid before the Library Committee. There still remains about 1,800L sterling to the credit of the Library, subject to accounts for orders yet unexecuted, principally relating to Books from Paris.

All which is respectfully submitted.

Alpheus Todd,  
Librarian, Legislative Assembly.

Library of Parliament,  
15th February, 1856.

---

#### APPENDIX.

---

#### LIST OF DONATIONS TO THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

##### From the Board of Admiralty.

A collection of Maps and Charts selected by the Hydrographer to the Admiralty, for the Library, and afterwards bound in 23 volumes. A series of Sailing Directions and other official publications. 54 vols.

From the Board of Ordnance.

A complete series, so far as published, of the Maps of the Ordnance Survey of Great Britain and Ireland. 2,736 sheets.

From the Board of Trade.

Statistical Tables of the United Kingdom and its dependencies, from 1820 to 1853. 46 vols. folio.

From the Museum of Practical Geology.

Reports on Geology and Fossil remains, in Devon and Cornwall, by Sir H. de la Beche, and Professor Phillips. 2 vols.

Memoirs of the Geological Survey of Great Britain. 2 vols.

British Organic Remains. 7 Decades.

Records of the School of Mines. 4 parts.

Mining Records and Mineral Statistics, for 1853-4.

Catalogue and Specimens of British Pottery and of the Fossils and Marbles, in the Museum. 2 vols.

Reports of the Department of Science and Art.

Royle on the Fibrous Plants of India.

From the Board of Health.

Series of Reports and other publications. 10 vols.

From the Treasury.

Sopwith on Coal and Iron Mines in the Forest of Dean.

Pollock on Geology of Londonderry, Tyrone, &c.

Magnetical and Meteorological Observations at Colonial Observatories, 5 vols.

Course of Mathematics taught at Woolwich, 3 volumes.

Boxer's Treatise on Artillery, and on Congreve Rockets.

Queen's Regulations of the Army, with Addenda, and Infantry Manual.

Historical Records of Regiments of the British Army. 68 volumes.

From the Rolls House.

Public Records of Great Britain; the whole series of these publications, except-

(21)

ing certain of the volumes of which no copies remain in store. In all 91 volumes.  
State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII. 10 volumes.

From the Foreign Office.

British and Foreign State Papers, (1812 to 1837.) 25 volumes.

Bulletins of State Intelligence, (1791 to 1853.) 61 volumes.

Papers on Foreign Relations. 8 volumes.

From the British Museum.

Illustrations of Terra Cotta Marbles in the Museum. 7 volumes. 4to.

Catalogue of Zoological Specimens in the Museum. 37 volumes.

From the House of Lords.

Journals of the House of Lords, complete to the present time. 100 volumes.

Sessional Papers of the House of Lords, from 1790 to 1854. 1200 volumes.

From the House of Commons.

Sessional Papers of the House of Commons from 1806 to 1825, and from 1844 to 1850, and 1854, to complete a set partly purchased. 803 volumes.

From the Commissioners of Patents.

Indices of Patents, chronological, alphabetical, and subject matter, granted since the 14th of James I., (1617.) 4 volumes.

*Reference Index of Patents of Inventions, with Appendix. 2 volumes.*

*Indices of Patents, chronological, alphabetical, and subject matter, granted from 1st October, 1852 to 31st December, 1854. 4 volumes.*

*Specifications of Patents, old series of 12,977, enrolled under the old law.*

*New series under the Act of 1852; Selected series of Specifications and Drawings on the subject of Fire Arms, Projectiles, &c., from 1718 to 1853; complete series of Specifications and Drawings on the subject of Reaping Machines, to the end of 1853.*

*Journal of the Commissioners of Patents from its commencement in January, 1854.*

*The British and Foreign Bible Society.*

*Copies of the different versions of the Holy Scriptures in Foreign languages, published under the direction of the Society. 90 or 100 vols.*

*From the Anti-Corn Law League.*

*A copy of their Prize Essay on the effects of Free Trade.*

*From the Right Honorable Sir William Molesworth.*

*His Edition of the complete Works of Hobbes of Malmesbury. 16 volumes.*

*From Henry Drummond, Esquire, M.P.*

*His History of Noble British Families. 2 volumes, folio.*

*From Joseph Amesbury, Esquire, M.D.*

*His Work on the treatment of Fractures. 2 volumes.*

*From ----- Pettengall, Esquire.*

*Papers on Kinematics.*

*From Mr. Vincent Brooks.*

*Specimens of the Art of Color Printing.*

*N.B.--Complete Lists have not yet been received of the Donations presented to the Library by order of the Imperial Government of France. Hereafter fuller particulars thereof will be laid before the House.*

(22)

*DONATIONS RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES.*

*From Peter Force, Esquire, of Washington.*

*His Collection of Historical Tracts. 4 volumes.*

*From the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.*

*History of General Braddock's Expedition against Fort Duquesne, in 1755: by Winthrop Sargent.*

MR. BROWN said that, with the leave of the House, he would take that early opportunity of calling attention to the necessity of a Committee being appointed to revise the rules of the House. There were several points on which he thought a change was absolutely necessary, in order to the proper government of their proceedings. There was one point in particular to which Mr. Speaker had, last session, directed the attention of the House. That was, in reference to the easy way in which Bills amended in the Upper House, were brought down, after having received, it might be, important amendments, and were<sup>14</sup> hurried through the House,<sup>15</sup> without the members knowing anything about them. Some change also was necessary in reference to the principles on which the Standing Rules were suspended. At the end of a session, it almost appeared as if they had no rules at all. A member simply got up and moved that a standing rule be suspended; as a matter of favour it was granted, and the Bill got through. If they had rules at all, they should be strictly observed, or

some definite process should be prescribed in accordance with which the rules could be relaxed. He thought it would be very desirable to carry out the Speaker's suggestion, made at the end of last session, to appoint a Committee to revise the rules, and he presumed the services of the Speaker could be obtained upon it.<sup>16</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said he did not think any member of the Government could object to the rules being revised, where a revision was necessary.<sup>17</sup> The Rules of the House were equally stringent with those of any other legislative body, and it only required that they should be observed, which he felt certain would afford sufficient protection at all times and under all circumstances.<sup>18</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) gave some further instances of the defects of the rules. He said that with a view to no measure's passing without its being fully understood, it was provided that no bill should have<sup>19</sup> more than one reading in the same day<sup>20</sup>. But a bill comes down from the Upper House, is read a first time, or rather its title is read pro forma; it is then referred to a committee; that committee reports upon it perhaps without amendments; it is read a second and third time nominally, and often a bill is passed in that way without a single clause of it having been once read in the Lower House. It was from having frequently witnessed measures passed in that hurried manner, that his hon. friend, the member for Lambton, had been induced to bring the matter forward. The old rules, however, if properly enforced, provided against such a contingency as that he had mentioned. When a bill came down from the Upper House, and was reported whether with or without amendments, it ought to be referred to a committee of the whole House, and then be read at the table. That used to be done in former times, and the practice should be returned to. But many bills had passed, and numbers of the members knew nothing about them, until they saw them on the Statute Book.<sup>21</sup>

MR. BROWN said another suggestion might be offered, and it was this, that the amendments made in the Upper House on a Bill sent up there, should be printed in the votes and proceedings of the Lower House. A Bill was sent from the Lower to the Upper House last session, to separate Halton from Wentworth. It came back with a clause which had the effect, and which was inserted for the purpose of taking 3,500L from the pockets of a mercantile firm in this city. Two members of this House were watching the matter, expecting that a Bill for that purpose would be introduced, but as it was introduced in that way into another Bill in the Upper House, it passed without their knowing anything at all about it. After what had fallen from the gallant knight he had no doubt that an understanding would be come to, in reference to moving for such a Committee as he had suggested.<sup>22</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said that if a Bill could be so hurried through the House as suggested (sic) by the honorable gentleman, it must have been done very adroitly.<sup>23</sup>

No decision was arrived at on this proposition<sup>24</sup>.

(22)

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*The House adjourned.*

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: APPEAL TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL.]

MR. C. DAOUST [donne avis que] mercredi [il fera motion pour un] Bill pour abolir le droit d'appel au conseil privé.<sup>25</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.]

MR. J. SMITH [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il fera motion pour un] Bill pour amender la loi qui pourvoit à l'indemnité des membres de l'assemblée législative.<sup>26</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SEIGNIORIAL TENURE.]

MR. C. DAOUST [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse priant son excellence de vouloir bien communiquer à cette chambre copie des instructions données par le gouvernement aux commissaires nommés pour mettre à effet l'acte seigneurial de 1854, et copie de toute correspondance à ce sujet, ainsi qu'un état des dépenses encourues jusqu'à ce jour sous l'autorité du dit acte.<sup>27</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.]

MR. C. DAOUST [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse pour copie du rapport de A. Larue, écuyer, relativement aux dommages occasionnés par la jetée construite à la tête du canal de Beauharnois.<sup>28</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SEIGNIORIAL TENURE.]

MR. A. DORION [donne avis que] jeudi prochain [il proposera] qu'une humble adresse soit présentée à son excellence le gouverneur général le priant de faire mettre devant cette chambre:

1o. Un état des diverses sommes de deniers qui ont été placées au crédit du fonds spécial approprié pour aider les censitaires à racheter les droits seigneuriaux et à payer les dépenses nécessaires pour y parvenir en vertu de l'acte seigneurial de 1854 et de l'amendement de 1855 fait à cet acte, indiquant le montant tant en capital qu'intérêts provenant du fonds consolidé de la province et des différentes sources de revenus mentionnés dans les clauses 17 et 18 de l'acte de 1854.

2o. Un état de toutes les dépenses encourues jusqu'au 1er février 1856, pour émoluments des commissaires ou déboursés faits par eux ainsi que toutes celles résultant des sessions de la cour seigneuriale et pour toute autre cause quelconque en vertu des dispositions de l'acte seigneurial de 1854 et de l'amendement de 1855, avec les noms des personnes auxquelles ces sommes ont été payées ou sont encore dues, la nature des devoirs remplis par chacune d'elles.

3o. Un état de toutes les sommes de deniers qui ont été payées jusqu'au 1er février 1856 à tout propriétaire de fief ou seigneur dans le Bas-Canada, indiquant si les sommes payées à chacun d'eux sont pour intérêts ou pour le capital à eux dû, si c'est à compte ou pour acquit final de leur réclamation sur le fonds seigneurial.

4o. Le nom de tous les seigneurs qui ont jusqu'au 1er février 1856 produit un état attesté de leurs réclamations pour quint ou lods et ventes conformément à la 3e clause de l'acte 1855, amendant l'acte seigneurial de 1854, et le montant de chacun d'eux.

50. Le nom des seigneurs dont les cadastres ont été complétés et transmis au receveur général conformément à la 13e clause de l'acte seigneurial de 1854.

60. Le nom de toutes les personnes qui sont ou qui ont été employées comme (sic) commissaires ou autrement en vertu des dispositions de l'acte seigneurial de 1854, et de l'amendement de 1855, la nature de leurs fonctions ou occupations, et le montant de leurs salaires, honoraires ou émoluments.<sup>29</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: GENERAL ELECTION OF 1854.]

MR. PAPIN [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before the House a List shewing:

1. The names of the Returning Officer[s] for the General Election of 1854, who made [to] the Government the Returns required by the 66th Section of the 12 Vic., c. 27, and who annexed thereto all the necessary vouchers.

2. Of the Returning Officers for the said General Election who made to the government Returns without annexing thereto all the necessary vouchers.

3. Those Returning Officers who did not make such Returns.<sup>30</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. J.S. MACDONALD [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il fera motion] pour faire lire les parties du journal de la chambre pour 1849 qui se rapportent à l'adresse de cette chambre à son excellence le gouverneur général, et à la réponse à icelle, relativement à la convocation du parlement alternativement à Toronto et à Québec, à l'effet d'adopter une résolution déclarant l'inexpédience de continuer plus longtemps ce système.<sup>31</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION RE: DAILY RECESS IN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.]

MR. S. SMITH (Northumberland) moved that the House adjourn every day at 6 o'clock, and that the Speaker again take the Chair at 7.<sup>32</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER suggested that the House should not adjourn, but that a Standing Order might be made, that the Speaker do leave the Chair at six o'clock and take it again at 7--and that the Member for Northumberland do alter his motion to that effect.<sup>33</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB suggested that it would be better to allow the motion to stand as a notice<sup>34</sup>.

MR. S. SMITH consented.<sup>35</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: INDIAN LANDS.]

MR. JACKSON moved that an address be presented to his Excellency, for correspondence and other documents relative to withdrawal from sale of certain lands in the counties of Grey and Bruce advertised to be sold on the 17th October, 1855.<sup>36</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB stated that the Government had no objection to producing the papers, but it could not be done till his Excellency's Speech was answered.<sup>37</sup> It would be better to defer this until the Address was passed.<sup>38</sup>

MR. JACKSON accordingly allowed his motion to stand over.<sup>39</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 18 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. GLOBE, 19 February 1856, reports "the Speaker took the chair at three o'clock. Before the doors were opened, ... some conversation took place on the subject of the inadequate accommodation for Reporters."
2. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
3. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
4. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856, reports another petition presented by Mr. Young "from the Board of Trade of Montreal, praying for an alteration of the Tariff, so as to encourage manufactures in this country". This petition does not appear in the JOURNALS.
5. GLOBE, 19 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856, in a commentary, deprecates the content of this petition.
6. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
7. IBID.
8. IBID.
9. IBID.
10. IBID.
11. IBID.
12. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
13. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
14. IBID.
15. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
16. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
17. IBID.
18. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
19. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
20. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
21. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
22. IBID.
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
24. Telegraph (MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT, 19 February 1856).
25. LE PAYS, 26 February 1856.
26. IBID.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. IBID.
30. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
31. LE PAYS, 26 February 1856.
32. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
33. IBID.
34. IBID.
35. IBID.
36. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.
37. IBID.
38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 19 February 1856.
39. GLOBE, 19 February 1856.

TUESDAY, 19 FEBRUARY 1856.

(22)

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House the Accounts of the Trinity Houses of Quebec and Montreal, for the year ending 31st December, 1855.

*For the said Accounts, see Appendix (No. 1.)*

*The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--*

*By Mr. Holton,--The Petition of the Montreal Protestant Orphan Asylum; and the Petition of the Managers of the Protestant Industrial House of Refuge of Montreal.*

*By Mr. Freeman,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Saltfleet, County of Wentworth.*

*By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of John Wade, of the Township of Hamilton; and Benjamin Seymour, of the Town of Port Hope.*

*By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of Gédéon Brien dit Desroches.*

*By Mr. Conger,--Three Petitions of the United Counties of Peterborough and Victoria.*

*By Mr. Whitney,--The Petition of the Reverend James Reid, D.D., and others, of the Parish of Saint Armand East, County of Missisquoi.*

*By Mr. Guévremont,--The Petition of the Trustees of the Dissident Schools of the Scholastic Municipality of the Borough of Sorel, County of Richelieu.*

*By Mr. Jackson,--Two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Grey.*

*By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of A. McNabb and others, Reeves of the County of Bruce; the Petition of the Reeves and Deputy Reeves of the Townships in the County of Bruce; and two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Huron and Bruce.*

MR. JACKSON then moved for an Address to His Excellency for Correspondence and other documents relative to the withdrawal from sale of certain lands in the Counties of Grey and Bruce, advertised to be sold on the 17th October, 1855.<sup>1</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB ... was understood to say that the Report of the Superintendent would be laid before the House forthwith, but that other papers could not be brought down till after the Reply was adopted to his Excellency's Speech. He had no objections to the Address being adopted in the meantime.<sup>2</sup>

(22)

*On motion of Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Hartman,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, copies of correspondence and other documents having reference to the withdrawal from sale of certain Lands situate in the Counties of Grey and Bruce, which lands were advertized to be sold on the seventeenth of October last; also, the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

The order of the day for the Resolutions for the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne being called,<sup>3</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal), suggested the postponement of the debate till to-morrow, the resolutions having been put in the hands of a few of the members only last night, and not having been distributed in French even now. Amendments had been prepared with all possible speed, and were placed in the hands of the printer only about half an hour ago. Under those circumstances he thought it would be well to postpone the debate until to-morrow.<sup>4</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB.--We are always very desirous to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, but there are other considerations which must have weight with us. One of these is, that it is the usual practice in this House as well as in the House of Commons, to proceed with the reply to the Speech immediately. There was no necessity for the resolutions being distributed a long time beforehand, as they are merely the echo of the Speech from the throne, making use of almost the same words. But I myself yesterday afternoon enclosed copies to my honourable friends opposite, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and the two hon. gentlemen who occupy the next bench (Mr. J.S. Macdonald and Mr. Brown.)<sup>5</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I never got it.<sup>6</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB.--It is, nevertheless, true that I sent off, with my own hand, copies to those three hon. gentlemen. And blame may be attached to the Government if we allow time to be lost before proceeding to the consideration of what is a mere echo of the Speech. I am willing, however, that the debate shall be postponed, but am requested to state that after to-morrow we will not allow it further to be put off.<sup>7</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--We do not want any further delay. I should have said also, that one of the objects of my application was to allow the Administration time to see the amendments before we go into discussion on the questions raised.<sup>8</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB.--If that is your only reason for delay, we are prepared to go on at once.<sup>9</sup>

MR. S. SMITH (Northumberland).--I hope we, on this side of the House, will not be charged after this by hon. gentlemen opposite with keeping back the business. The charge is this time altogether the other way.<sup>10</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD, (Glengary).--And I hope that we will have as little ground to complain of the Government for keeping back their measures, as they have to complain of us on this occasion. The hon. member for Montreal has stated the reason why we are not prepared to go on, because the French copies of the resolutions are not yet in the hands of the French members, and because there has not been sufficient time to have our amendments printed. The gallant Knight says that the reply is a mere echo of the speech, but it is well known that the phraseology often differs very much, and it was necessary that we should have an opportunity of meeting to-gether to consider it. If the resolutions are a mere echo, why were not the Administration able to concoct them in a less time than from Friday afternoon till last night? And I may add that it is too much to ask us to be prepared to meet on so short a notice the very extraordinary issues which have been raised. (Hear, hear.)<sup>11</sup>

MR. POWELL said he sympathized as much as any one could with the opposition, in the difficulties they must labour under in attempting to assail the speech from the Throne on the present occasion, but he wished the country to understand<sup>12</sup> that the blame of the delay and the consequent waste of time was incurred on account of those hon. gentlemen not being prepared to enter on the discussion of the address.<sup>13</sup> It was a mere subterfuge for the opposition to say, that they were not before last night, in full possession of what was the nature of the resolutions.<sup>14</sup> The country at large would understand that the resolutions, being a mere echo of the address, no member could complain of not knowing what would be the nature of these resolutions. (Hear, hear.)<sup>15</sup> Nor was it any argument, that the administration were not in possession of the amendments to be moved by hon. gentlemen opposite. When the administration asked for delay on that ground, it would then be time to urge that argument, but not before.<sup>16</sup> It was very desirable that as little delay as possible should occur.<sup>17</sup>

MR. HOLTON said that an amendment had been framed with special reference to an important subject, in which the member for Carleton (Mr. Powell) was interested as well as himself, but on which the Speech from the Throne was entirely silent. It was as much for the sake of the member for Carleton and others situated like him on the Ministerial side, as for any other reason, that it had been thought necessary to place in their hands before the discussion came on, the amendments on which they would be called upon to vote.<sup>18</sup>

MR. WILSON asked if the Reply was a mere echo, why members had not received that echo on Friday evening? He for one did not see it till this morning, and the blame of the delay, such as it was, must rest with the Government for not sooner distributing their resolutions.<sup>19</sup> [He] thought that if the majority of the members desired to postpone its consideration, the ministry had no right to complain.<sup>20</sup>

MR. BROWN said there was one thing of a very satisfactory nature which had appeared during this conversation, the anxiety, namely, of gentlemen on both sides, to get on with the public business. (Hear, hear.) This was something new, but he hoped it would be shewn by the future conduct of gentlemen on both sides of the house that they were really in earnest. But after all, this little delay was not a very serious matter, and gentlemen opposite must see that as the members on his side had only seen the resolutions that morning, it was not very much to ask a delay till to-morrow, in order that the amendments which were now ready might be printed and distributed, and that gentlemen opposite might understand exactly what they were to debate about. And as the resolutions themselves had only been printed for the French members between two and three o'clock that afternoon, it was unfair to ask them to proceed. He was quite sure that the whole house would gain by the delay now sought.<sup>21</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said that, if it was the desire of the House that the debate should be postponed till to-morrow, he was quite willing. At the same time, he did not postpone it on account of any desire to see the amendments of the hon. gentlemen opposite.<sup>22</sup> (Laughter).<sup>23</sup>

MR. HOLTON.--I dare say not. (Hear, hear.)<sup>24</sup>

[MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB:] As the matter rested so far with him, he would, therefore, move that the further consideration of the question be postponed till

to-morrow. (Loud cries of "no, no".) It was, he continued, very difficult to know what to do in the matter; but he had no objection to its standing over till to-morrow.<sup>25</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER then put the motion for postponement, which was carried.<sup>26</sup>

(23)

*The Order of the day for taking into consideration the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Provincial Legislature, being read;*

*On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*Ordered, That the said Order of the day be postponed until To-morrow.*

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*The House adjourned.*

APPENDIX: 19 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ROAD ALLOWANCE FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF HALDIMAND.]

MR. S. SMITH [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to vest in Ephraim Doolittle and Robert Johnston the allowance for Road between Lots numbers fourteen and fifteen in Broken Front, Concession A, of the Township of Haldimand, in the County of Northumberland.<sup>27</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: CIRCUIT COURT IN THE COUNTY OF HUNTINGDON.]

MR. SOMERVILLE [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to establish a Circuit Court in and for the County of Huntingdon and part of the County of Chateaugay.<sup>28</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: EDUCATION IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. SOMERVILLE [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Lower Canada School Acts.<sup>29</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: COSTS OF SUIT.]

MR. LORANGER [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to secure to creditors attaching the effects of their debtors a privileged claim for their costs of suit upon the monies arising from judicial sales.<sup>30</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: RIOTS IN THE CITY OF QUEBEC.]

MR. FERRES [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to repeal in part an Act passed in the 16th year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled, "An Act to provide a remedy against the Corporation of the City of Quebec in case of injury to property by any mob, or during riots in the said City."<sup>31</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: LAW OF EVIDENCE.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Law of Evidence.<sup>32</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: CIVIL EXECUTIONS.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to prevent the issue of Execution against the lands of testators or intestate persons without notice to the heirs or devisees.<sup>33</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: LOTTERIES.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Monday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill for the suppression of Lotteries.<sup>34</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ARGENTEUIL.]

MR. BELLINGHAM [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to provide for the erection of a new limit in the District of Ottawa, to be called the Argenteuil Circuit.<sup>35</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. BELLINGHAM [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Act 16 Vic., c. 18, to provide for the better organization of Agricultural Societies in Lower Canada, so as to extend its provisions to the present County of Argenteuil.<sup>36</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: LACHUTE COLLEGE.]

MR. BELLINGHAM [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to incorporate La Chute College.<sup>37</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION ACT.]

MR. BELLINGHAM [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill further to amend the ... Representation Act of 1853.<sup>38</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM.]

MR. BELLINGHAM [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to erect part of the Township of Chatham, in the County of Argenteuil, into a Municipality.<sup>39</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: INDEPENDENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.]

MR. LABERGE [donne avis qu'il proposera un] Acte pour amender la 2e section de l'acte 18 Vict., ch. 86.<sup>40</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: SQUATTERS IN THE TOWNSHIPS OF LOWER CANADA.]

MR. J. DORION [donne avis que] jeudi prochain [il fera motion pour un] Bill pour protéger les colons qui se sont établis sur des terres, sans connaître les propriétaires, dans les townships du Bas-Canada.<sup>41</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE CROWN LANDS DEPARTMENT.]

MR. POWELL [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this house, copies of all [de]partmental orders by which the public are excluded from admission to the offices of the Crown Land Department.<sup>42</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE CROWN LANDS DEPARTMENT.]

MR. J.S. MACDONALD [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House copies of any Orders in Council, and of any notice or orders signed by the Commissioner of Crown Lands since the first day of

January, 1855, having reference to any change in the system which formerly permitted the Public to have direct access to books, maps, and papers connected with the Crown Timber Land Department.<sup>43</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. PATRICK [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, representing to His Excellency that in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when a different and much more satisfactory arrangement may be made as regards the place of convening Parliament than at present exists; That the present system of alternate Parliaments is inconsistent with a proper regard to the economical expenditure of public money, uncalled for by the necessities of the Country, injurious to the preservation and methodical arrangement of the Public Archives and Library, and productive of great inconvenience and injustice to permanent officers in the Public Departments, and that the same ought to be changed, and a permanent place selected for the assembling of Parliament, and that the City of Ottawa, being the most convenient location, be selected as the place for the assembling of Parliament.<sup>44</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: TRADE WITH OTHER COUNTRIES.]

MR. MERRITT [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of all Instructions, papers of (sic) correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Provincial Authorities of this Province on the subject of reciprocal Trade betwe[e]n Canada and the North American colonies, the West India Islands, or foreign Countries, together with copies of all correspondence which may have been communicated to His Excellency, between the Secretary of State, the Colonial Minister and the Governments of Guinea, Barbadoes, or any of the West India Islands on their commercial intercourse with Canada.<sup>45</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CLERGY RESERVES.]

MR. J. SMITH [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House, a Rsturn (sic), showing in detail the parties and bodies with whom commutation has been mnde (sic) under the Provincial Statute, 18 Vic., ch. 2, sec. 3; the age of each party or incumbent, and the amount paid to them respectively, the date of commutation in each case, also the amount of stipend allowances assigned or given to each party or body at the time of the passing of the Imperial Act, 16 Vic., ch. 21; and a statement of the names in which such commutation may have been invested or appropriated; also, the amount of the fund arising from sales of Clergy Reserve Lands already made, and the quantity of lands called Clergy Reserves remaining unsold on the 31st day of December last, in each section of the Province.<sup>46</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: ORDNANCE PROPERTY.]

MR. COOKE [donne avis qu'il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence pour copie de la correspondance échangée entre le gouvernement impérial et les autorités provinciales de cette province au sujet de la prise de possession des canaux, terrains et autres propriétés appartenant au département de l'ordonnance en cette province.<sup>47</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: MUNICIPAL LOAN FUND.]

MR. BUREAU [donne avis qu'il proposera] qu'une humble adresse soit présentée à son excellence le gouverneur général le priant de faire mettre devant cette chambre:

1. Un état des sommes obtenues par les municipalités du Haut et du Bas-Canada, conformément à l'acte 16 Vict. chap. 22, qui, jusqu'au 1<sup>er</sup> février présent, ont négligé de payer au désir du dit acte les 6 par cent ou qui ont payé l'intérêt et partie du principal de l'emprunt qu'ils ont fait par d'autres voies et moyens que ceux indiqués par le dit acte.

2. Par quel revenu et par quelles personnes ou corporations les dits intérêts ou partie au principal ont été payés jusqu'au premier février présent.

3. Quelles sont les municipalités qui doivent des arrérages, et quelle est la balance due au 1<sup>er</sup> février présent.

4. Pour quel objet a été contracté l'emprunt.

5. Si l'entreprise qu'on avait en vue a été accomplie ou non.<sup>48</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: COMMON SCHOOLS.]

MR. J. DORION [donne avis que] jeudi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence pour demander un état détaillé des sommes payées pour les écoles communes dans le Haut et le Bas-Canada, respectivement, pour l'année 1854 (sic).<sup>49</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR FURTHER INFORMATION RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. LORANGER [donne avis] qu'en sus des informations demandées par l'adresse votée par cette chambre le 18 courant relative aux dépenses occasionnées par la translation du siège du gouvernement de Québec à Toronto, demandera que son excellence le gouverneur général soit prié d'ajouter à ses informations une description des caisses et boîtes contenant des archives ou documents parlementaires et gouvernementaires (sic), les meubles et ameublements du (sic) bureaux publics qui ont été perdus ou égarés (sic) dans le trajet de Québec à Toronto, avec l'énumération aussi détaillée que possible de ces archives, documents, meubles et ameublements.<sup>50</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE RE: PUBLIC LANDS.]

MR. GALT [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for a] Select Committee of seven members to enquire into the management and disposal of the Public Lands; said Committee to consist of the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, Hon. J.S. Macdonald, Hon. Mr. Robinson, Mr. Holton, Hon. Mr. Merritt, Mr. Egan, and the Mover.<sup>51</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION RE: DAILY RECESS IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.]

DR. T. FORTIER [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move] that from and after Wednesday next until the end of the Session, Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair from six o'clock until half-past seven o'clock in the afternoon.<sup>52</sup>

## [NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY PASSED IN 1855 RELATIVE TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether any and what answer has been received to the Address of this House to Her Most Gracious Majesty, on the subject of the removal of certain disabilities under which the Church of England labored in this Colony.<sup>53</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY PASSED IN 1855 RELATIVE TO DEBTS.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether any and what answer has been received to the Address of this House to Her Most Gracious Majesty, on the subject of the repeal of various British Statutes in reference to the reception of evidence by affidavits, in this Province.<sup>54</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: ANNUAL GRANT FOR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.]

MR. DUFRESNE [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether it is their intention to increase the annual grant for the support of Elementary Schools in this Province.<sup>55</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: QUEBEC TURNPIKE ROADS.]

MR. POULIOT [donne avis qu'il] demandera au gouvernement s'il a l'intention (sic) de nommer une commission pour vérifier les allégués de la requête du conseil municipal de St. Anselme, dans Dorchester, à son excellence le gouverneur général, présentée en décembre dernier, se plaignant de la commission des chemins à barrières du district de Québec, relativement aux chemins qui sont sous contrôle, et notamment à la partie d'iceux qui monte de la Pointe Lévi à St. Henri (non compris la section faite par le major Fournier), et ce que le gouvernement se propose de faire à ce sujet.<sup>56</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: REGISTRY LAWS.]

DR. MASSON [donne avis qu'il] demandera au ministère si c'est l'intention du gouvernement d'introduire durant cette session quelque mesure pour le paiement des registrateurs et de leur[s] députés qui ont agi comme officiers-rapporteurs d'après l'acte des municipalités et des chemins de 1855.<sup>57</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 19 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
2. GLOBE, 20 February 1856. This newspaper reports that "Sir Allan MacNab was nearly inaudible in the reporters' gallery". It also reports the following short commentary on the defective accommodations for reporters in the Assembly: "The galleries are so situated that in no single position can members on both sides of the House be heard, and it is very difficult indeed to understand what is said even on one side. As to seeing, that is impossible, without craning like a timorous fox hunter. The front boards of the galleries have been made as broad as if giants were to sit behind them. Light galleries of iron, set two feet lower than the present, might have answered in the localities now used; but it is useless to talk of them now. There are two places which would suit the reporters well. One is their old seat, in front of the strangers' gallery; the other is on the floor of the House, near the Speaker's chair. In the latter place, it would only be necessary to find space for one member of each corps, say four seats. Other members of the press, to whom the accurate reporting of every word is not necessary, might occupy the present galleries. We beg to call the serious attention of the members to the subject. If they desire to be well reported, they must put the short-hand writers in a good place."
3. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 20 February 1856. GLOBE, 20 February 1856, specifies that "the first and only item on the Order of the Day, was--Consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session".
4. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
5. IBID.
6. IBID.
7. IBID.
8. IBID.
9. IBID.
10. IBID.
11. IBID.
12. IBID.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
14. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
15. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
16. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
18. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
19. IBID.
20. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
21. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
22. IBID.
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
24. GLOBE, 20 February 1856.
25. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
26. IBID.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. IBID.
30. IBID.
31. IBID.
32. IBID.

33. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
34. IBID.
35. IBID.
36. IBID.
37. IBID.
38. IBID.
39. IBID.
40. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
41. LE PAYS, 26 February 1856.
42. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
43. IBID.
44. IBID.
45. IBID.
46. IBID.
47. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
48. LE PAYS, 26 February 1856.
49. IBID.
50. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
51. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856.
52. IBID.
53. IBID.
54. IBID.
55. IBID.
56. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
57. IBID.

WEDNESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 1856.

(23)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Church,--The Petition of James Edwards and others, of the Township of Oxford, County of Grenville.

By Mr. Christie,--The Petition of Horace Capron and others, of the Township of South Dumfries.

By Mr. Chapais,--The Petition of the Corporation of the College of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of Peter Lampman and Adam Stull.

By Mr. Larwill,--Two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Kent.

By Mr. Bowes,--The Petition of Charles Robertson and others, Members of the Board of United Separate School Trustees for the City of Toronto.

By Mr. James Smith,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Northumberland and Durham.

By Mr. Rhodes,--The Petition of the Corporation of the College of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière.

By Mr. Rankin,--The Petition of Joseph Smith Lee, of the City of Ottawa.

By Mr. Southwick,--The Petition of D.J. Hughes and others, of the Town of St. Thomas, County of Elgin.

By Mr. Chisholm,--The Petition of the Milton Mechanics' Institute and Library Association.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of the Reverend L.J. Guyon, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Ste. Elizabeth; praying for aid to enable them to enlarge and repair the Academy of the said Parish.

Of the Reverend J.B. St. Germain, Curé, of the Parish of St. Laurent, Island of Montreal; praying for aid in behalf of L'Academie Industrielle, in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend J.B. St. Germain, Curé, of the Parish of St. Laurent, Island of Montreal; praying for aid in behalf of La Communauté des Soeurs de Ste. Croix, in the said Parish.

Of Joseph Allard and others, residing along the line of the Montreal and Kingston Railway; praying that the Act 14 & 15 Vic. cap. 51, may be amended.

Of the Mechanics' Institute and Library Association of Lanoraie; praying for aid.

Of the Corporation of the College of L'Assomption; praying for aid.

(24)

Of T.N. Ball and others, inhabitants of the Township of Thorold, County of Welland; praying for the passing of an Act to enable the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company to extend their Road from Thorold to Port Colborne on Lake Erie.

Of the Institut Canadien of Montreal; praying for aid.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton; praying that a Survey may be made in order to determine the probable cost of opening a continuous line of water communication from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence by the Valley of the Ottawa.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton; praying for aid for the Ottawa and Prescott Railway Company.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Carleton; praying for the passing of an Act to provide for the payment of Jurors out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Simcoe; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the running of Cars on the different Railroads in this Province on the Sabbath.

Of Ogle R. Gowan, of the City of Toronto, Grand Master of the Orange Association, and others; praying for an Act of Incorporation.

Of Sister M.J. Hainault dite Deschamps and others, Sisters of Charity in charge of the General Hospital in the City of Montreal; praying for aid.

Of Louis Leclair and others, of the City of Montreal; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of l'Union St. Joseph de Montréal.

Of G.H. Ryland, Vice-President, and Thomas Austin, Secretary-Treasurer, of the Association of Registrars in Lower Canada; praying that measures may be devised for their relief, either by augmenting their fees or granting them salaries proportionate with the heavy securities required of them by law.

Of Jacques Viger, President, and the Very Reverend A.F. Truteau, Secretary, on behalf of the Association of the School of St. Jacques, Montreal; praying for an additional aid in behalf of the said School.

Of the Quebec Board of Trade; praying that Funds may be set apart for the immediate commencement of a Canal and other works necessary for the completion of an uninterrupted water communication from the St. Lawrence through the Ottawa Valley to Lake Huron.

Of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City of Quebec; praying that a certain tract of land may be granted to the North Shore Railroad Company, upon the guarantee of which they could procure from foreign capitalists the necessary funds for the construction of the said Road.

Of the Municipality of the Parish of St. Martin, County of Laval; praying for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into all transactions of the Montreal and Bytown Railway Company since its incorporation.

Of Michel Bibaud, of the City of Montreal; praying for aid to enable him to publish a continuation of his work on the History of Canada.

Of W.W. Fisher and others, of the Parish of St. Bernard de Lacolle, County of St. John; praying that the said Parish may be annexed to the County of Napierville.

Of the Reverend J.D. Laporte and others, School Commissioners and others, of the Parish of St. Ambroise de Kildare, County of Joliette; praying for aid in behalf of the Academy in the said Parish.

Of Edouard Bourassa and others, of the Village of L'Avenir; praying that a permanent Seat of Government may be established.

Of Charles Charpentier and others, of the Village of L'Avenir; praying that the annual grant of 50,000L. for Common Schools, may be increased to 150,000L.

On the question of the reception of ... [the petition] presented by Mr. Dorion (Drummond) praying among other things for the recall of his Excellency Sir Edmund Head,<sup>1</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said he hoped that the hon. gentleman who presented this petition did not wish it to be received to-day. It was a petition asking this Legis[la]ture to request the Governor General to be recalled from this country. This was a question over which they had no control. Not having read the petition he could say nothing in reference to it, but having seen a notice of it in the papers, he hoped the hon. gentleman would allow it to lie over till to-morrow.<sup>2</sup>

MR. J. DORION (Drummond) said he had no objection.<sup>3</sup>

(25)

*Of Sister Marie St. Maurice Borgel, Superior of the Sisters of the Presentation of Mary, at St. Hughes, County of Bagot; praying for aid.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lanark and Renfrew; praying that any application for the passing of an Act, having for its purpose the restraining of any other than a certain description of wagon from travelling on the public highways within the said United Counties, may not be granted.*

DR. T. FORTIER (Nicolet) moved that the Speaker leave the chair every evening from six to half-past seven o'clock.<sup>4</sup>

MR. HARTMAN thought that an hour and a half's recess was too much. In former sessions the recess had only been an hour and they found that sufficient.<sup>5</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH said that hon. members must remember that in Quebec they all lived within a short distance of the House and, therefore, had sufficient time in an hour's recess. But it was not so here. Some of the members lived<sup>6</sup> a mile, a mile and a half or three miles from the House<sup>7</sup> and he thought the hon. member had consulted the wishes and convenience of the members in making the time an hour and a half.<sup>8</sup>

MR. BROWN was desirous to consult the wishes of the members by making the recess an hour and a half. But at the same time it was quite clear that if they did not meet till half-past 7 o'clock they must extend the time for the adjournment of the House to half past 10 or 11 o'clock, and he thought that such a clause should have been inserted.<sup>9</sup>

DR. T. FORTIER said it was his intention to have fixed the hour of adjournment, but was informed that it was not constitutional to do it on such a motion. To prevent discussion, he had therefore brought up the motion, simply with reference to the one point mentioned.<sup>10</sup> That matter ... might be made the subject of a separate resolution.<sup>11</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH asked if it referred to their proceedings to-day as well?<sup>12</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER replied in the affirmative.<sup>13</sup>

The motion was then adopted.<sup>14</sup>

(25)

*On motion of Mr. Thomas Fortier, seconded by Mr. LeBoutillier,  
Resolved, That from this day until the close of the present Session, Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair from six o'clock to half-past seven o'clock in the afternoon.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB believed that the House was now prepared to proceed to the consideration of His Excellency's speech, the amendments having been printed and distributed. He moved, therefore, that the notices of motion be passed over, and the Order of the Day taken up.<sup>15</sup>

MR. FERRES asked leave to introduce a bill.<sup>16</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said he would have time for that to-morrow.<sup>17</sup>

MR. S. SMITH said they had adjourned last night in consequence of the resolutions in amendment not being prepared. These amendments had just been laid upon the table, and it was too much to ask the House to go into the consideration of so important a matter now. He would suggest, therefore, that the opposition should have another day to get something more really worthy their cause than the amendments just printed.<sup>18</sup>

[Mr. MacNab's] motion was agreed to.<sup>19</sup>

(25)

*On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read;*

*And the Order of the day being read, for taking into consideration the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Provincial Legislature;*

*The House proceeded accordingly to take the said Speech into consideration.*

MR. EVANTUREL then proposed the address in answer to the speech from the throne. The hon. member spoke in French and at some length.<sup>20</sup> J'accepte de bien bon coeur la tâche difficile mais honorable de présenter les résolutions que je tiens à la main, en réponse au discours du trône. Je sais que j'obéis en cela à l'usage de tout temps établi dans cette honorable chambre, qui exige que ces résolutions soient présentées par le plus jeune des membres.

J'accepte d'autant plus volontiers cette tâche qu'elle me fournit l'occasion d'exprimer ma confiance en l'administration actuelle et mon approbation des principes fondamentaux sur lesquels elle s'est basée. En ce faisant, je pourrai aussi laisser entrevoir à cette honorable chambre la route politique que je compte suivre comme homme public, et comme humble représentant du peuple.

Mon peu d'expérience m'a appris déjà que les gouvernements constitutionnels et surtout notre gouvernement responsable sont essentiellement des gouvernements de partis. Je suis convaincu que le représentant du peuple qui veut se montrer homme politique, qui désire le bien de son pays et compte y travailler sérieusement, doit nécessairement adopter un parti d'une nuance tranchée et prendre la résolution de défendre la bannière sous laquelle il vient de s'enrôler.

Quant au représentant du peuple qui, sous prétexte de rester indépendant, ne veut se mêler dans les rangs d'aucun parti, il lui est impossible d'arriver à un but quelconque, si ce n'est à celui d'être isolé et abandonné de tous.

Je ne crains pas de dire que l'honorable membre pour Haldimand est un exemple frappant de ce que j'avance, puisque malgré son énergie et son activité, rien de ce qu'il propose ne peut lui réussir, grâce à l'isolement créé autour de lui par son indépendance.

Je dois donc, M. l'Orateur, choisir un parti et m'y attacher avec courage et résolution. Mais ces partis quels sont-ils? Je crois qu'en Amérique il n'en est qu'un seul, c'est le grand parti libéral. Le progrès y est à l'ordre du jour. En Amérique, jamais un peuple ne rétrograde. Il n'y a même qu'un seul danger à craindre pour lui, c'est qu'il n'aille trop vite et c'est ce que je veux éviter; car en la voie politique plus encore que dans tout autre genre de route, les courses effrénées sont toujours périlleuses.

Placé, dès mon début, entre le parti libéral conservateur, modéré, national et le parti libéral avancé, je n'hésite pas un seul instant à me ranger du côté ministériel qui représente le premier. Je n'aime pas à rester inactif, stationnaire; je veux marcher, mais marcher lentement pour le faire avec plus de sûreté. J'aime à marcher au bord de l'abîme que je puisse le contempler un instant avant de tenter de le franchir, et prendre même un chemin détourné s'il peut me conduire à mon but avec moins de danger. C'est la route qu'ont envié la plupart des hommes politiques qui ont combattu avant nous, et c'est, suivant moi, la seule que nous devons suivre si nous tenons à conserver nos droits et surtout notre nationalité. Je n'oublierai jamais le sage conseil que nous donne, en terminant son histoire, M. F.X. Garneau, que les honorables membres du parti ultra-démocrate n'oseront certainement pas accuser d'être anti-national. Après avoir assisté pour ainsi dire à toutes les luttes longues et terribles que nous avons eu à soutenir, dans les temps d'oppression, après avoir défendu nos droits, notre langue et nos institutions, il termine sa revue historique en disant aux Canadiens-Français: "Si vous voulez vous conserver comme peuple, ne vous laissez pas aller à toutes ces innovations sociales et politiques. C'est le fait des grands peuples." Je partage entièrement cette opinion. Je crois que les constitutions doivent être mesurées selon la position, les moeurs, le caractère et les usages des peuples. Je crois que telle constitution qui fonctionne très-bien chez un peuple, peut n'amener que de très-mauvais résultats chez un peuple voisin. Pour quiconque veut considérer un instant la marche des gouvernements, il est facile de se convaincre que la pratique ne répond pas toujours à la théorie. Si les membres de l'opposition paraissent ne point tourner assez leur attention vers cette différence, si l'on veut des théories, je me déclare républicain renforcé; j'admets que cette forme de gouvernement est la plus parfaite. Montrez-moi un peuple placé dans toutes les conditions exigées pour la forme républicaine; donnez-moi un peuple ayant une seule origine, une seule religion, donnez-moi enfin un peuple de rois, et je serai républicain. Mais sans ces conditions, je resterai toujours en faveur du gouvernement qui marche de pair avec l'éducation politique de la nation. Telle est la raison qui m'a fait tendre mes pas, et sans regarder en arrière, vers le grand parti libéral-conservateur.

Voyons à présent si l'administration actuelle a prouvé, par ses actes, qu'elle entend marcher de pair avec l'opinion publique.

Cette grande question seigneuriale qui a bouleversé le pays pendant de si longues années, qui a osé la décider si ce n'est l'administration actuelle? On me dira peut-être que ce règlement n'est pas suffisant; j'admettrai même, si vous le voulez, que la solution n'est pas parfaite; mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que le gouvernement n'a pas craint d'aborder en face cette difficulté et de travailler à la faire disparaître.

Cette autre affaire des réserves, question brûlante s'il en fût jamais dans le pays, qui encore a osé la trancher? l'administration actuelle! N'est-ce pas aussi cette administration qui a admis le principe électif pour le conseil législatif, et qui, à cet effet, compte proposer un nouveau bill.

A propos du conseil législatif, qu'il me soit permis, M. l'orateur, de placer ici une réflexion tendant à prouver qu'il est toujours dangereux de vouloir avancer trop rapidement. Je me rap[p]elle qu'un de nos hommes publics disait, relativement à cette question, qu'on ne devait toucher à la constitution qu'avec la plus grande circonspection, et qu'en demandant à l'Angleterre des altérations, il fallait craindre de fournir à cette dernière l'occasion d'opérer des changemens sur d'autres points. On avait demandé depuis longtemps l'abolition du conseil législatif, parce que ce conseil rejetait obstinément toutes les mesures populaires proposées dans la chambre basse. On avait en cela mille fois raison. Aujourd'hui les situations

politiques sont changées et l'on demande l'abolition du même corps parce qu'il condescend trop volontiers aux désirs du gouvernement, désirs qui ne sont, comme on le sait, que l'expression de la volonté populaire.

Je ne suis point contraire au conseil législatif, mais ce que je veux dire ici, c'est que la demande dont je parle a été cause que la clause de l'acte d'union, qui nous a toujours sauvés, nous Bas-Canadiens et surtout nous Canadiens Français, a été déclarée nulle; de sorte qu'aujourd'hui une seule voie de majorité dans cette chambre va suffire pour changer la représentation du peuple et donner la prépondérance au Haut-Canada. Je ne crains pas de dire ici que la réforme opérée dans le conseil législatif, réforme que nous nous sommes tant hâtés de demander, ne compensera jamais le mal qui nous a été fait par l'exclusion de cette clause de l'acte d'union, déclarant qu'il fallait les deux tiers des membres de cette chambre pour pouvoir effectuer quelques changements dans la représentation. Je donne ce fait comme une preuve que l'on ne gagne pas toujours en voulant aller trop vite.

Je suis heureux de voir que l'administration actuelle veut prendre des mesures pour arriver à la modification de nos lois. On ne peut nier que l'administration du jour n'ait déployé de l'énergie et n'ait montré un esprit d'initiative qu'il faut savoir louer dans un gouvernement.

L'honorable premier ministre a dit un jour: "Ma politique est une politique de chemins de fer." Eh! bien, j'accepte cette politique, car j[l']espère qu'elle s'appliquera à tout chemin de fer tendant à servir les intérêts du pays. Je viens revendiquer ici les droits de cette grande voie ferrée qui fera communiquer un jour la baie Géorgienne avec la ville de Québec. Je ne crains point de dire que si je me suis décidé à entrer dans l'arène politique, c'est principalement dans le but de devenir un des champions de cette grande entreprise du chemin de fer du Nord, et j'ai tout lieu d'espérer que la présente administration ne refusera pas de s'occuper de cette amélioration. Pour ma part, M. l'Orateur, je voterai contre l'administration actuelle, si elle s'y refuse lorsque le temps opportun sera venu. Je considère comme une grande faute, au point de vue national, au point de vue stratégique, l'oubli dans lequel on laisserait mourir le projet d'un chemin de fer<sup>21</sup> de Québec<sup>22</sup> à Halifax. Si nous voulons assurer notre pays contre l'invasion américaine, il nous faut une voie ferrée exclusivement sur le sol britannique et au nord du Saint-Laurent, cette barrière que nos voisins ne sauront jamais franchir.

Je vais terminer mes remarques, M. l'Orateur, afin de ne pas abuser de la patience de cette chambre. Je voterai in toto pour le discours du trône, en présentant les résolutions que l'hon. membre pour Peterborough a bien voulu seconder. Je voterai contre tout amendement que l'on pourrait proposer à ces résolutions, parce que je le considérerai comme une expression de non-confiance en l'administration actuelle et que je compte défendre cette administration jusqu'au jour où se rendant coupable d'actes contraires aux vrais intérêts du pays, elle me pousserait à aller grossir les rangs de ses ennemis.<sup>23</sup>

MR. CONGER said he rose with great satisfaction to second the address which had just been so ably moved. He looked upon the fact of the Administration calling Parliament together at this period as an indication that they had an elective government to carry on the business of the country in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. He congratulated the House and the country on the settlement of the Clergy Reserves. For years past that vexed question had done much to keep back the improvements of the country, and disturb its peace and prosperity, and therefore he looked upon the settlement of that question as a great boon to the country.<sup>24</sup> (Cries of hear, hear.)<sup>25</sup> Although that settlement might not be to the satisfaction of every member of the community, still he thought it was in accordance with the views of a very large majority of the people of Canada. (No! No!--hear,

hear; yes, no, no.) Hon. gentleman (sic) might say no, no, but no better evidence of the correctness of his remark need be required than the fact that it enabled persons, who had heretofore been prevented meeting to-gether, now to meet on common ground and labor for the best interests of the country. (Hear, hear.) He was happy to find that a large amount of the revenues of the Clergy Reserves were now to be placed at the disposal of the country for purposes of general improvement. (Hear, hear.) It was very important that this should be done at once, because the country would be more advantaged by the money placed at their disposal now, than if done hereafter. He congratulated the House upon the proposal for the establishment of an efficient Police force. It was absolutely necessary that the civil authority should be strengthened, and in his opinion there was no way in which this could be better done than by the establishment of a Police force, such as that suggested in the speech. It was generally acknowledged throughout the country that there was not a sufficient protection afforded to life and property, and that some means should be employed by the Government to remedy this deficiency. He was therefore satisfied that this was one of the measures desired by the country, and he rejoiced that it had been brought forward by the Administration.<sup>26</sup> The construction of the grand line of railways, added to the magnificent water communication they already possessed, must have a tendency to place Canada on an equality with any country in the world, so far as internal improvements were concerned. He beli[e]ved that her citizens looked forward with great anxiety to the successful completion of those works.<sup>27</sup> He was happy to find that the Government had interested themselves in their construction. It was with great satisfaction that he observed it was the intention of the Administration to recommend to the House some measures by which the abridgement of the laws of this country may be carried out. It was only necessary to examine the Statute Book to see the importance of taking some steps for the revision and consolidation of the law. An improvement in the construction and management of the common jails of the country was another measure which he regarded as one of great importance to the inhabitants of the country. Heretofore, no means had been provided by which a proper classification of prisoners could be effected--no means by which the juvenile offenders could be separated from the old and hardened criminals. A great deal of mischief had unquestionably been done by them, thus being placed together, while at the same time no means had been provided for the education of the youthful offenders--those who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the authorities. He looked (sic) forward therefore to this measure as one of importance, and he trusted the House would take up the question in such a way as to meet the necessities of the case. He had great satisfaction generally in supporting the resolutions. He trusted they would be adopted--if not by a unanimous vote of the House--at least by a very large majority. (Hear, hear.) It was of the utmost importance to go on with the business ef (sic) the country, and could see nothing to gain by gentlemen opposite, endeavoring to throw back the public improvements by getting up an opposition te (sic) the Address. The only effect of such opposition would be to prevent the business going on. There was no doubt the resolutions would be adopted.<sup>28</sup>

(25)

*Mr. Evanturel moved, seconded by Mr. Conger, and the Question being proposed, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:*

*To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season, in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation*

should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises, in like manner, to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council by rendering it elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the

(26)

fact that this progress is not confined to one section of the Province, and that the lines Eastward to St. Thomas, and Westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since their last meeting nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentment of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing the Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement, calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs duties which were made by the Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted

(27)

to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency that, although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two Countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic we have, however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:

That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:

That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will

*rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event.*

*Ordered, That the Question be put upon each paragraph of the said motion.*

*And the first paragraph being again read, was agreed to.*

*The second paragraph<sup>29</sup> being again read, as followeth:--To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded;*

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) next addressed the House. He said he rose for the purpose of putting at once before the House the questions which he thought ought to have formed part of the address, and to which he thought the attention of the Legislature ought to have been called by the Governor. As regarded the first paragraph, it was in accordance with the wishes of the House repeatedly expressed that the House had been called together in the middle of February, as the most convenient time for the members. But the very object of wishing an early meeting of Parliament was that those measures which concerned the general interests of the country should be brought forward, that the House might have time carefully to examine them and to legislate upon them. It was with regret, therefore, that a great many members of this House, and he had no doubt a very large proportion of the population in both sections of the Province, had perceived that those measures which were expected from one end of the country to the other to be brought forward this session, were not even mentioned in his Excellency's speech. He must say that when he looked at the Speech, he hardly found anything in it. He believed that some followers of the Administration had remarked that very little could be said against the Speech, because it contained so very little. (Laughter.) And it did contain very little, beyond a few references to measures of past legislation of a doubtful character, the effect of which was not yet fully known, but which, when it was fully felt by the people of Canada, would, he had no doubt, raise such a cry as would be more than sufficient to condemn the whole course of the administration. The House was called upon in a very faint way, to legislate in reference to the constitution of the Legislative Council. His Excellency said, that a measure to render the Council Elective would be submitted, but immediately upon that, they heard all the newspaper organs of the administration say, that there was no necessity (*sic*) for such a measure, and that it had only been mentioned to preserve the consistency of some of the Lower Canadian members of the Administration. And, singularly enough, that sentiment was echoed by the very member who came forward to move the Address. (Hear, hear.) That hon. member stated that it was very wrong for the Legislature to have presented an address to the Imperial Parliament for such a change in our constitution as would render the Legislative Council elective. Was it, then to be believed, when such sentiments were expressed by all the organs of the Government, and even by the hon. member who stood forward to move the Address, a professed follower of the Administration, inspired by them, who must have been conferrred (*sic*) with by them about the Speech and the answer to be given to it, and when the measure was announced in such faint and reserved terms in the Speech itself--could it in such circumstances be believed that that measure would be carried through? (Hear, hear.) If there was any one measure popular in the whole of the eastern part of the province, it was this measure of the Legislative Council, and he believed it was popular too in a great majority of the counties of Upper Canada. (No, no.) It was said that they had no ground for complaint against the Legislative Council, that the only complaint was

that it was too subservient to the will of the Administration. It was not that he complained of, but he complained that last session and the session before, the most important measures had been unceremoniously thrown out by the Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) Did not the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Evanturel) recollect (sic) the indignation that was raised against the Legislative Council, the session before last? when the measure for the abolition of the Seignorial Tenure was thrown out by that body. And did he recollect that last session the measure on the same subject, brought down by the administration, and passed by this House, was sent to the Legislative Council, and was there changed from the first clause to the last, and a new measure sent down by the Legislative Council? (Hear, hear.) Did he not recollect how the Elective Council Bill, for which all the members of this House had voted, with four exceptions, and which had passed this House by immense majorities in three successive sessions--how that bill was destroyed by the Council, in opposition to the will of the representatives of the people. Would it be said that they were subservient to the will of the Administration? If this was the case, was it possible that the Administration went and compelled them not to pass those measures? (Hear, hear.) The speech of the hon. member for Quebec was calculated to induce the House to believe that such was the fact. If they were so subservient, how otherwise could it have been that three successive most important measures which had got the sanction of this House had been defeated in the Upper House? (Hear, hear.) But besides the Legislative Council measure he really saw nothing in the speech, and of course having nothing else to say, ministers had to make reference to past legislation. They referred therefore to the Seignorial Tenure. When the Seignorial Tenure Act was passed, the country was given to understand that it would take but a few months to settle the whole matter. But they were yet quite in the dark as to the effects of that legislation. All they knew was that the Seignorial court had been sitting since the 4th September to decide certain questions submitted by the Government, and that that court had not yet decided those questions. They knew that 13 out of the 14 Judges of Lower Canada had been taken away from their ordinary avocations, that the courts had been almost closed, and their proceedings suspended, on account of the Judges being taken away to decide those Seignorial Tenure questions, which after all did not require any very great amount of time to arrive at a decision. (Hear, hear.) It was a fact that no business had been done before the Court of Appeal since the month of July, that not a single judgment had been rendered or a case heard before that court. (Hear, hear.) In the other courts, others had been named to replace the regular judges, but of course this arrangement was of a temporary character, and scarcely one important case had been argued before them since the month of September, and they could therefore fairly assume that the whole business of the judiciary in Lower Canada had been suspended by the operation of that Seignorial Tenure Act. The House was called upon to state that they were satisfied with what had been done. But if rumours were true the people would not be satisfied with what had been done, and with the enormous expenses created by the measure. (Hear, hear.) It was to him (Mr. Dorion) and to others in this House painful to see, when the Administration came down with an address acknowledging a very large diminution in the revenues of the Province, which it was known would amount to pretty nearly 300,000L in one year, and when they knew that trade was depressed in every part of the Province, and at all events in the whole of the Lower Province and in two-thirds of the Upper, and that it was in such a condition that if it did not revive they could not expect an increase of revenue for a long time to come--in these circumstances it was painful to see that they could not get from the Government any commercial policy--any suggestion thrown out how they were to remedy the evils, or how they were to raise the revenue necessary to pay the interest of that enormous debt which was staring them in the face, the Provincial debt being now

fifty millions of dollars, including the indirect liabilities, and he was certain that the Administration well knew that a large portion of those indirect liabilities would have to be footed, or that the interest would have to be paid by the Province. When it was acknowledged in the Address that the trade of the country was in a very depressed state, and that the revenue was considerably diminished, it was matter for regret to every one who had at heart the welfare of the country that no policy was indicated to meet that unfavourable state of matters. All the reference to it in the speech was a doleful complaint and expression of regret that the timber trade was in a depressed state, and that Montreal and Quebec were suffering in consequence. It must have been by some singular process that it was discovered that Montreal was suffering from this cause, for any one who knew anything at all on the subject must be aware that the merchants of Montreal had not probably shipped a single load of timber for the last ten years. It would certainly be a piece of news to them, that they were suffering considerably from the depression of the timber trade. Surely it could not have been the hon. Provincial Secretary who suggested that extraordinary announcement being made to the House of Assembly. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The reason of the depression of (sic) the trade of Montreal was well known to every one who had examined the tables of its imports and exports. It would be found that Montreal both imported and exported large quantities of wheat and flour, but that this year it had not imported or exported one-fourth of the amount it usually did. It was that, and not any depression in the timber trade that had caused the falling off in the business of Montreal. It was on account of the wheat trade having taken another direction, going through the canals to the ocean. Seeing that the trade had for several years been falling off, it was the duty of the Government to have enquired into the cause of it, and to have ascertained whether the noble St. Lawrence should have been made a mere tributary to the ditch, as it had been called of the Erie Canal, whether our lakes and rivers should only be used as means of transit to carry our products to Oswego and Buffalo and Rochester, for the Erie Canal, or whether internal improvements could not be made, so that instead of taking our own produce away from our own waters, we could take the produce of the Western States through our own canals to the ocean. It was in such subjects as these, that the people were interested. They cared very little for a Provincial Police, but they did care for the material prosperity and improvements of the country. They cared also for the very important question of education. (Hear, hear.) And whatever hon. members might learn from His Excellency's speech, they would, no doubt, learn with great satisfaction, that the entire world approved of the zeal they had shown in the cause of education. (Hear, hear.) The members of the administration had been travelling throughout the world during the recess, and they came back with this information to communicate, that the whole world admired our zeal for education. (Hear, hear and laughter.) But it appeared they were to be satisfied with that zeal, and were not to express that zeal in any practical measure. But there were a few scores of juvenile beggars, who must be restrained from begging, and must receive some education. Their whole zeal for education must expend itself in taking care of the juvenile offenders, of whom he hoped there were not very many in this country. He was not opposed to providing for the proper education and proper care of juvenile offenders, but their number was so limited, compared with the immense numbers of other children of school age, who were not attending school, that he considered it a matter of comparatively little importance. And he considered that the best means of having no offenders at all was to give to all that education which would raise the morals of the people. It was by spreading education that they would prevent the recurrence of such scenes as had recently disgraced a portion of our country. (Hear, hear.) It would not do to punish

individuals, and indeed society had no right to punish them, unless it provided them with that proper education which would enable them to distinguish between right and wrong. The question of E[d]ucation was so important a one for Lower Canada, that he believed there was scarcely a member of the House from the Lower section who had not expected that in his Excellency's Address there would have been some policy on that question announced, or something said about the establishment of a Normal School. There was not a single member from Lower Canada who had not expected that the improvements to be made upon the system of Education would be the question of the Session. In every one of the Reports of the Superintendent of Schools for Lower Canada since 1845, there was an allusion made to the necessity of having a Normal School. The result of its absence was, that of the 3,000 school teachers in Lower Canada, only 642 had certificates that they were qualified to teach, and of these 80 or 90 were females. Of the whole number of teachers, 1,600 were females of the age of from 18 to 25. What results, then, could they expect, even if the children attended their schools regularly, for what could they learn from teachers unable to teach them? The feeling in favor of a Normal School was so strong that the Legislature in 1851 voted an appropriation of 10,000L for the purpose of building a Normal School. Would it be believed that that law, which now stood on our Statute Book, had been wholly disregarded by the Administration?<sup>30</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--What law is that? Is it the law of 1841?<sup>31</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--It was in 1851. The hon. gentleman understood it very well. (Hear, hear.) The same law had a clause attached providing for the appointment of School Inspectors, and singularly enough that clause was carried out. The administration availed themselves of the patronage attached to the law, by immediately appointing 24 School Inspectors, most of them unqualified, while the most important part of the law, that for establishing a Normal School, had been entirely disregarded. Only by one hon. gentleman, then a member of the administration, the hon. member for Montreal (hon. Mr. Young) had the attempt been made to carry it out. He purchased property in Montreal on which to build a Normal School, but nothing further had been done, and the hon. gentleman, the only efficient member of the administration, the only one who sought to put into operation the laws of the Legislature, had been obliged to leave the administration. Mr. Dorion then quoted from Reports by the Chief Superintendent of Education, and from Reports by the Inspectors, who, he said, although many of them were ill qualified, had shown considerable zeal in the discharge of their duties, all showing that from Ottawa to Gaspe there was the same cry, that a Normal School was absolutely required. The necessity for taking action on the question of education could also be proved from the records on the Journals of the House. In 1852, on the motion of the present Speaker, then a member on the floor of the House, a committee was appointed to enquire into the working of the educational system of Lower Canada. That committee was composed of some of the ablest men in the House, Mf. (sic) Sicotte, Attorney General Drummond, Honourable Mr. Badgley, Hon. Mr. Cartier, Mr. Lacoste, Mr. Christie, of Gaspe and others, showing what importance was attached to the subject, and they unanimously reported, condemning the present law, and suggesting the improvements which were required, among which were to be found the establishment of a Board of Education, and the founding of Normal Schools. Two of the members of the present Administration were on that committee, and they certainly could not plead ignorance of the causes of the present low state of Education in Lower Canada, that with a population nearly the same, above 100,000 more children attended school in Upper than in Lower Canada. In Upper Canada, out of 277,000 children of school

age, there were attending school, 217,000. In Lower Canada out of probably 275,000 children of school age, only 119,000 attended school. From the Reports of the Inspectors, it was evident that there was a universal desire and expectation over the country, that something should be done to change the present law, and to improve the schools, and that expectation was met by the administration simply telling them that all the world admired their zeal for education. This was not the time to dwell upon the importance of education. The subject was too well understood throughout the country to render that necessary, but he must say that the members of the Administration were bound from the places where they stood to state the cause why the law of 1851 had not been put in operation. (Hear, hear.) What was the obstacle in the way? Was it that the people were so ignorant that they could not appreciate the value of education? The School Inspectors reported that the very opposite was the case, and that the people most anxiously desired an improvement in our educational system. Or was it that it was opposed by parties who comprehended very well, and dreaded the effects of general education? If that was the case, let the Administration boldly take their stand against any such opposition, and he ventured to say that they would be supported by the whole of the well-educated portion of the people of Lower Canada. Let them come boldly out, and say that the opposition was such as prevented them from carrying the law into effect, and he assured them that they would be supported not only by every member on that side of the House, but by every man who had any education in Lower Canada. And if they did not succeed, if ignorance must rule in Lower Canada, he would say that it was a country not fit to be inhabited by any free man. But he was not afraid of that. He knew that the educated portion of the people of Lower Canada would stand together, and ask for a good system of schools, and vanquish all opposition which could be set up against them. (Hear, hear.)<sup>32</sup> In 1848, we had an administration who had the support of that house and a very large majority of the country; yet by their vacillation they had soon lost the confidence of the house and of the country, and their supporters gradually fell away and finally that administration fell to pieces. Then there were their successors in 1851, selected for the purpose of carrying out these measures of Reform, which were required by the country. These men continued in power up to 1854, and then they coolly told us that it was not yet time to grant us those Reforms, and it was then that a vote of the people told them that they were not the men they wanted to do their work, and a vote of that House told them that the work which they had neglected should be entrusted to other and faithful hands.<sup>33</sup> Gentlemen upon the other side would find that a cry would be raised from one end of the country to the other, if the reforms so greatly needed were not pretty soon passed. The subject of internal improvements he desired to see fully and fairly discussed, as some measure was necessary to bring back to our country the trade which was going from us, and to prevent the Province from becoming a mere tributary of the Erie canal. For one he was not satisfied to stand still this session. Last year when he came into Parliament he expected that the Ministry would be in favour of establishing a Normal School and the Provincial Secretary, who was then in charge of business relating to school matters, positively stated that not only one, but three Normal Schools should be established.<sup>34</sup>

"No, no," from the ministerial side of the house<sup>35</sup>.

MR. A. DORION asserted that he had been told by Mr. Chaveau that there would be a separate Normal School established--one for the Roman Catholics; one for the Church of England, and one for the Presbyterians.<sup>36</sup>

MR. S. SMITH, "No, no."<sup>37</sup>

[MR. A. DORION continued:] If Upper Canada desired to see Lower Canada go hand in hand with her in improvement and progress, she must aid her in getting that system of education which was required in Lower Canada. In Upper Canada, they had a Board of Public Instruction to superintend the system of education; while in Lower Canada, they had nothing of the kind whatever. Give them a Normal School, and a proper proportionate share of the Treasury of the country, and they would soon have that system of education which was required, and which would be applicable to their necessities. Not only did the learned Provincial Secretary tell them that Normal Schools were needed, but, when he (Mr. Dorion) was about to move resolutions upon the subject of education, with a view of testing the opinion of the House upon that question, he was told by the Provincial Secretary that he himself would prepare a law upon that subject, as soon as the assessment was made up. In view of the facts he had presented upon this subject, he was greatly desirous that something should be done in reference to a measure of reform so greatly needed; and he hoped at this session that some action might be had, by which the cause of education in Lower Canada should be advanced and successfully carried forward. In conclusion, Mr. Dorion said he came here to legislate on the important subjects which had agitated the country; but not being satisfied with the address and answer, he felt himself compelled to move the amendments, which he would now read. He would move the following words:--

That the following words be added to the first paragraph: "But this House would be wanting in its duty, if it failed to express its deep regret at learning that His Excellency has not been advised to recommend to the consideration of this House any measures relating to the important subject of General Education, especially in the Eastern section of the Province; nor to certain important branches of the trade and commerce of the Province which are now in a very depressed state; nor to the subject of those internal improvements which are absolutely requisite to give additional facilities for the transit of the produce of the West to the Ocean. And this House feels bound to declare that the absence of all reference to those subjects will be considered by the People of this Province as an abandonment by His Excellency's advisers of what they consider measures of paramount importance."<sup>38</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER read the amendment of Mr. Dorion.<sup>39</sup>

MR. MERRITT rose to support the amendment. He remarked that after the able manner in which his learned friend had explained the object of the amendment, he had very little to add. He<sup>40</sup> would in the first place take that opportunity to express his regret that the consideration of the speech had been delayed a single hour, because he took it for granted that the reply would be merely an echo of the speech; and because every member of Parliament ought to come there prepared with all the information to discuss the matter thoroughly. If members came there seeking for information they would be very much disappointed. (Laughter). He might state at the commencement that he objected to the system pursued by Canadian Administrations.<sup>41</sup> Two opportunities are offered us to discuss the general affairs of the province<sup>42</sup>. Here they were now, at the opening of the session, called upon to give an (sic) answer to the Governor's speech; and at the close of session, the Ministry would come down with their budget--all the items of which they would be asked to adopt much in the same style that they were asked to adopt His Excellency's speech. Every member must, surely, be aware of the absurdity of such a system. They were called on to answer a speech about which they, in fact, had no information; and when the budget came down, at the close of the session, they would also be called upon to sanction every expenditure it contained--whether it was right or wrong. No doubt there would be some opposition offered to the expenditures on the ground of their

extravagance, inutility, and so forth, but it eventually ended in futile discussion. It might be said, "Why not move a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry and turn them out?" But he did not see that even that course would remedy the evil they complained of; for every Ministry elected, pursued the same system.<sup>43</sup> (Hear, hear.) The present system is a nullity. What is the remedy? Nothing less than a change in our constitution. This will restrain the Government in its expenditure and make it subject to the will of the people. The Government should be deprived of the power to get us into debt. Measures should have the sanction of this House before being carried into effect. In the absence of this change, which we are sure to have bye-and-bye, our only present remedy is to call on Government to pass a law requiring that reports of the public accounts be laid before the Legislature at the commencement instead of the close of the session. He wished for no innovation, but he in common with others did wish to learn at the commencement of the session the amount of receipts, disbursements, &c., in order that they might be prepared understandingly to legislate on every subject. It was a subject, he said, which he had not taken up hastily, but was the result of many years' reflection. He submitted the subject to the Finance Committee some time ago.<sup>44</sup> He had always felt that a great necessity existed for submitting reports to that House, which should not consist merely of dry and, in many cases, unintelligible details, but reports of such a simplified and comprehensive nature as would put every schoolboy in Canada in possession of the information required. By this system they would be enabled to know accurately the state of the revenue and finances, but without it, they would be in darkness, and compelled to vote, as in the present instance, without a sufficient knowledge of what they were voting for. In seconding the resolution of his hon. friend, he had only to say that he had heard, with great pleasure, his able remarks respecting the educational system, and, therefore, he would not follow him in those remarks, nor take up the time of the House with showing the importance of Common School education; but he would show how it had been neglected, and Parliament had appropriated the money set apart for educational purposes. They had been told by His Excellency "that their zeal in the cause of education was known and appreciated by all the world." But, he would like to know, for what it had been appreciated? Was it for withholding the means of education from the masses--and neglecting the laws passed to sustain their educational system?<sup>45</sup> The appropriations for schools have been given to a favoured few<sup>46</sup>. In 1849, the Commissioner of Crown Lands<sup>47</sup> Mr. Price,<sup>48</sup> brought in a law to that House, which was passed unanimously. The tenor of that law would best be explained by its being read, and he would read it in order to show that House the absolute necessity of the Constitution which he advocated. We were, he continued, always led to consider that laws were binding. But it was not [s]o. He then read the law referred to, which was to the effect that all monies arising from the sale of public lands should be appropriated to form a school fund, until the amount reached 100,000L per annum, which sum should be appropriated to the public school fund; and that the money thus collected was to be invested in such companies as gave proper security and interest for the same. This money was not to be alienated for any other purpose, whatever, but was to be kept simply for the maintenance of the common schools and libraries<sup>49</sup> as a permanent fund.<sup>50</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--Read on.<sup>51</sup>

MR. MERRITT then continued the reading of the statute, which further stated that 1,000,000 acres of the public lands were to be appropriated for this purpose, the sale of which lands would produce an annual income of 50,000L. Now, he would ask, was that statute carried into effect. Where was the use in appropriating and selling those lands when they did not get the annual income of 50,000L therefrom?<sup>52</sup>

[OR] We should have had \$70,000 from the land fund, but our neglect to see the measure properly enforced has resulted in the receipt of only \$50,000.<sup>53</sup> The effect of this proceeding was, that the public were taxed twice for the amount. In the first place, out of the fund; and in the next by direct taxation. The hon. gentleman then read another act, from which he said it was plain that the government had no right to take one farthing of the money so raised. It was all to be appropriated to the Common School Fund until it amounted to 100,000L. The hon. gentleman then went on to show how this act had been virtually annulled and instanced the case of an adjoining State, in which, with lands not one-hundreth part of those appropriated in Canada,<sup>54</sup> they have a school fund of \$500,000, and add yearly to it the sum of \$25,000. In 1854 we had an opportunity to add to the fund from the Reserves. Had we done so, there would have been better satisfaction throughout the country on the subject of the Clergy Reserves. It would have gone far to allay feelings of dissatisfaction. Another opportunity is now offered, and he would call now upon the government to appropriate these monies to the School Fund, and not squander it upon roads, bridges or any other objects than those legitimately intended. Neglect the present opportunity and no other may be offered. He would urge it upon the consideration of government as a measure which would give universal satisfaction to the country at large.<sup>55</sup> The hon. gentleman then said the next subject spoken of in his amendment was that of trade and commerce--which he would leave to his learned friend from Montreal--who had given the subject a great deal of attention. The hon. gentlemen (*sic*) next alluded to the advantages of the St. Lawrence route for the conveyance of traffic.<sup>56</sup> We have our minds filled with the idea of railroads. What can they do? Carry a few hundred thousand tons. But cast your eye over our Western country, embracing 500,000 square miles, and consider the advantage which would accrue from the productions of this great country. The St. Lawrence is by far the shortest route for a passage from the west to England. Through this channel of transit freight can be carried from England to Chicago, *via* [the] St. Lawrence, cheaper than by New York or any other route. Have we the trade of the West? No, not even of Western Canada. Is it not lamentable that flour can be carried from the lakes cheaper by New York than by the St. Lawrence. What is the remedy for it? It is to complete the public works. The government should be subject to the reproach of the people, that so slight an obstruction as the removal of three bars in the St. Lawrence, in order to render the navigation perfect to Quebec, should have been so long delayed. The importance of the proposed Champlain Canal is evident. It is objected to in a financial point of view. But consider for a moment a parallel case. It is known that the Erie Canal has been enlarged, and the toll on flour is now 22 cents per barrel. This canal has not only paid the interest on the capital, but also yearly put into a Sinking Fund \$1,850,000, for the payment of the capital. They have a constitution which the Legislature cannot repeal. When this canal is paid for in full there will be no necessity for tolls, and it can then afford to carry flour to Albany at a toll [of] 2½ cents per barrel, and, perhaps, take it free of expense. What we should do is to divert the trade from this great thoroughfare to modes of transit through our own country. Now contrast this Erie Canal with our own canals. Not only do our canals not pay anything into a sinking fund, but they do not even pay the interest on their debt. The St. Lawrence Canal does not pay its expenses. When we ask for money, the reply is, we are in debt. Yet gentlemen should consider when raising this cry, whether the proposed use of the money will entail a debt. If it pays its own way, it is no debt. The obstructions in the St. Lawrence and the construction of the Champlain Canal, demands (*sic*) the serious and immediate attention of Government. Another matter of vital importance to the Province is the subject of a Police Force. It has been said that we are to have an armed Police. The speaker would ask what part of Canada demanded this new force.

There is not a county, town or even village that will yield its local government to a centralizing government. We have now the most efficient system of police in the world. Our safety is in our local institutions. They are under the immediate eye of the people. Every man is bound to support the constabulary force in the execution of the laws. What are you going to substitute? It is the power of the bayonet in place of the constabulary power. The Speaker referred to the riots of 1845 as a proof of the efficiency of the constabulary force. The Erie riot was cited, and the efficient action of this same force alluded to. He said that he thanked God that the country was still free. But the moment an armed police is organised, that moment is a firebrand cast into our midst. If, gentlemen, you calmly reflect and ask your constituents on the subject, they will tell you that a paid police is most objectionable. He would merely allude to this measure, and would express the hope that we might never see its passage.<sup>57</sup>

(27)

*Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion moved in amendment thereto, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Merritt, That the words "But this House would be wanting in its duty, if it failed to express its deep regret, at learning that His Excellency has not been advised to recommend to the consideration of this House, any measures relating to the important subject of General Education, especially in the Eastern Section of the Province; nor to certain important branches of the trade and commerce of the Province which are now in a very depressed state; nor to the subject of those internal improvements which are absolutely requisite to give additional facilities for the transit of the produce of the West to the Ocean. And this House feels bound to declare that the absence of all reference to those subjects will be considered by the People of this Province as a neglect by His Excellency's advisers of what they consider measures of paramount importance," be added at the end thereof;*

*And a Debate arising thereupon;*

MR. ROBINSON would like to know what connection the speech of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, had with the amendment before the House. He began by stating that he did not want to quarrel with the present Government, but with the system--he did not want to propose a vote of want of confidence in the Ministry--for, he admitted, they could get no better. Many of his remarks on education were very proper and just<sup>58</sup>. But the gentleman should be reminded that the Normal School Law is now in force in Lower Canada. Why it is not carried out, the speaker said he could not say.<sup>59</sup> From that point his hon. friend went to the public improvement of the country. And he (the speaker) would say that he thought his hon. friend had already a lion's share of the public improvement, (laughter.) It was, however, but an exemplification of the trite saying, that appetite always grows with what it feeds on. His former success had emboldened him to make a further demand. (Laughter.)<sup>60</sup> The honorable gentleman last up had spoken of the removal of two bars in the St. Lawrence as remedying all obstructions in its navigation. But he forgets that, from the nature and rapidity of the current, this is a work of great difficulty. Besides, it would be attended with enormous expense. The gentleman had explained to us how ships may descend the river, but does not inform us how they may be brought back again. He would have a channel twelve feet deep to accomplish the descent of the St. Lawrence, but seems to have forgotten that our canals, by which ships make the passage up the river, draw only nine feet of water.<sup>61</sup>

MR. MERRITT stated that ships which went down the river in twelve feet of water, could come up through the canals in nine feet of water.<sup>62</sup>

[MR. ROBINSON] would merely add, that whenever the fact was ascertained that the St. Lawrence could be further improved, his hon. friend opposite would have his most cordial support. He was, he continued, very much surprised at his hon. friend's remarks with reference to the proposed police system. The hon. gentleman then instanced a case in St. Catherines, of a riot, on which occasion he thought his friend opposite would have wished the aid of the police in quelling it. Very many of the subjects alluded to by his hon. friend, would, no doubt, come up in the course of the Session. And when they did thus come up in order, would be the proper time to debate them. Why his hon. friend should have taken it into his head to debate them all, on moving his amendment, he (Mr. R.) could not fathom. In conclusion, the hon. gentleman stated his intention of voting against the amendment.<sup>63</sup> He hoped that the matters contained in the address would receive the serious attention of the House.<sup>64</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER said that if he mistook not, the purport of the resolution proposed was, not to find fault with the speech for what it contained, but for what it omitted. And he really believed that if the whole of that resolution was embodied in His Excellency's speech, there would be nothing more added to it. In fact he never read a resolution with such pretensions as this one--the sole purport of which was to find fault with the omissions of His Excellency's speech. The hon. gentleman then read the resolution, and proceeded to say that there was no specification in it of those important branches of trade which it was represented were so depressed; nor did it contain a suggestion in any point whatever. When the hon. member for Montreal spoke of the depressed state of the trade of the Province, he said he supposed that that item of information had been suggested by the Provincial Secretary. Well, and what if it had? Did it not speak explicitly of a very important branch of trade which was really in a very depressed state? He contended that it did, and stated that had the resolution been half as explicit it would have been much more creditable to its concoctor's. He then went on to state that there was no allusion made to this branch of trade. He had listened attentively to the mover and seconder of the resolution in order to gather from them a correction of what was wanting in the speech, but he had listened in vain. With reference to what has fallen from the hon. member for Montreal, in regard to the education of the people of Lower Canada, everyone knew that the subject of education needed not to be referred to in such a speech.<sup>65</sup> If the remarks of that hon. gentleman from Montreal were true, everyone would be led to suppose, that Lower Canada was in a deplorable state of ignorance, but he could say truly, that such was not the case. (Cries of hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman found fault with his Excellency, because he had been pleased to say, that the education of the provinces had attracted general attention. Any one who was in the habit of reading the reports made by the superintendent of education for Upper and Lower Canada, must have come to the conclusion, that the cause of education had made great progress in both Provinces. This fact was evident to every person, who had at all examined the matter, and not only Upper, but Lower Canada had been praised in a neighboring republic for the progress they had made in the cause of education. Although as far as the advantages of elementary education were concerned, Upper Canada will far outstrip Lower Canada, yet there was one thing he could say, and which could not be contradicted by a member of the House, that education of a superior character in Lower Canada was far beyond what it was in Upper Canada. By a paper published in Toronto of great circulation, he found the sentiment expressed, that a great proportion of the students who frequented the Normal Schools in Upper Canada could not read and write.<sup>66</sup> (Loud cries of "No, no.")<sup>67</sup> He would not assert this as a fact, and he only repeated what was published

in a Toronto paper. No one could pretend that the students, who were turned out from these schools received such high and perfect education as those who frequented the Colleges and Universities in Lower Canada. Some reference had been made to the progress of education in Lower Canada. Take the report of the Superintendent for 1854, and compare it with 1853, and you will find that there was an increase of the number of children in the Common Schools. In 1853 the number of schools in Lower Canada was something like over 2,150, while in 1854 they increased in number to 2,500. More than 300 or 400 schools were established in one year in Lower Canada.<sup>68</sup>

Cries of hear, hear and no, no.<sup>69</sup>

[MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER continued:] The honorable member from Montreal may say no, no, and may say, compare that state of things with Upper Canada. He did not deem such comparison fair. Was the comparison to be made between the report of the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada and that of the Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada? No, it was not, but between the report of the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada made in 1854 with that of 1853. He would ask gentlemen, if the Government had really been inactive about the establishment of Common Schools? Arrangements had been made for the establishment of a Normal School in Lower Canada, but it was impossible for the government to make permanent arrangements in regard to this matter, because they had not the necessary amount of money appropriated to carry out that purpose.<sup>70</sup>

MR. A. DORION inquired, if the honorable gentleman would state what arrangements had been made.<sup>71</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER, in reply, said that when a measure relating to this subject was introduced, it would then be the proper time to discuss the matter. He would remind the hon. gentleman, that in a Speech from the Throne, it was not necessary to allude to a matter upon which legislation had already taken place, and in regard to which only a farther appropriation of money was required to carry it out. The hon. member from Montreal had said that the state of education in Lower Canada was in a most depressed condition. It was true, as he had already stated, that perhaps in elementary education Lower was behind Upper Canada; but the Colleges and Universities in Lower Canada turned out every year thousands of educated young men, abler school teachers than those who had been educated at the Normal School. He did not wish to disparage the Normal School, but he did not think that the want of such a school was greatly felt in Lower Canada.<sup>72</sup>

The House having adjourned for an hour and a half,<sup>73</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the chair at half past 7 o'clock.<sup>74</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER resumed his remarks in reply to the hon. member for Montreal. He went on to say that he had only to mention to this hon. House that the statements of the Superintendent for Education in Lower Canada during the year 1853 and 1854 (*sic*), proved that there was a very great increase in Lower Canada as far as it related not only to the number of pupils attending school, but also in regard to the number of schools established in Lower Canada. He had before him the analysis of the Report of the Superintendent of Education for these two years, and although he had a difficult task to perform to reply to the amendment, which complained that there was no allusion in the speech from the throne in reference to the Schools in Lower Canada, because there was nothing in that amendment, and he could

not bring something out of nothing, yet he would endeavour to answer the slander of the hon. member (sic) for Montreal (Mr. Dorion), who had done his utmost to prove the unfounded assertion that Lower Canada is steeped in ignorance (hear, hear.) There are publications that thrive in Upper Canada--because they assert that Lower Canadians, and by that term was generally understood those of French origin in Lower Canada--these publications thrive because they strive to make it out that the Lower Canadians are Roman Catholics, and because they are steeped in ignorance that they are so. He supposed the hon. member was endeavouring to prove that these publications were right in their assertions, for he wished to make out that the Lower Canadians are steeped in ignorance (hear, hear). No slander ever made upon his countrymen of French origin in Lower Canada was so cruel, so untrue as these expressions and reasonings and observations out of which the hon. member for Montreal had pled to make it out--that the Lower Canadians were steeped in ignorance. The other member for Montreal (Hon. Mr. Young,) was smiling at that because his sympathies were not with Lower Canada. It had been insinuated that in Lower Canada no progress was making (sic) in Education, while the reverse was the fact.<sup>75</sup> Comparing the state of education in Lower Canada in 1853 with what it was in 1854, he found that the number of educational institutions of all kinds there in 1853 was 2,352, while in 1854 the number was 2,571. In connection with this subject, he might mention the fact that when the Report of the Superintendent of Education for 1855 shall have been published, and this will be before two days are over, it will be found, that the number of schools in Lower Canada was about 3000.<sup>76</sup> If the reports from the superintendents of both provinces were compared the difference would not be found to be so very great. In Upper Canada for 1854 the number of Schools is given at 3,250, while as he had stated it would be found that the number in Lower Canada, was about 3,000. There was not so great a difference there as far as elementary schools are concerned. Although he would admit that elementary education in Upper Canada was to a certain extent in advance of what it was in Lower Canada, he would assert that before five years they would be on even ground with them; while as far as superior education, academical education, was concerned, Lower Canada<sup>77</sup> far surpassed Upper Canada. As proof of this statement, he need but cite gentlemen to the number of students turned out every year by the University of Toronto and the Upper Canada College, and then make a comparison with the number turned out by<sup>78</sup> the superior Colleges in Lower Canada.<sup>79</sup>

MR. WILSON.--What becomes of them all?<sup>80</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--They are, I suppose, all among your friends, and the rest of Lower Canada must be in a confounded state of ignorance.<sup>81</sup> A statement had been published in one of the Toronto papers which had great circulation in Upper Canada, that there were pupils in the Normal School here who could neither read nor write. This statement might be false, but he thought from the publication made in this paper as well as from other sources, that elementary education in Upper Canada was not prospering as well as was generally claimed for it by its friends. He thought that in Lower Canada they were following close after them in educational matters.<sup>82</sup>

A member inquired what was the name of the paper which had made use of the expression he had quoted.<sup>83</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER in reply said, it was the Globe.<sup>84</sup> [OR] I do not name the paper. Being further called upon, however, Mr. Cartier<sup>85</sup> alluded to the Grammar Schools in Upper Canada, and quoted from the Globe to show that the number of these

Schools was 64; and out of that number 26 were called Senior Schools. He said he had already shown that one of these Grammar Schools had been obliged to close for want of pupils, and the member for North York had said he was mistaken; but he would show them the extract from which he had quoted. The hon. member here read the extract<sup>86</sup> showing that the salaries of masters in Grammar Schools had decreased from 11,000L to 10,000L per annum last year in Upper Canada, and that<sup>87</sup> of the Grammar Schools 56 per cent, received pupils unable to write, and 33 per cent received pupils unable to read. The hon. member went on to say, that fault had been found in the Speech from the throne, because no allusion was made to education generally, and to education, particularly, in Lower Canada. The amendment now before the House alluded to education; but the way in which it alluded to it was a slander on Lower Canada. As one of the responsible advisers of His Excellency he was unwilling to perpetrate such a slander. They knew very well that education was making rapid progress in Lower Canada, and any allusion to it in His Excellency's Speech would have been a slander, because it would have implied that education was not progressing, while the contrary was the fact. They could not be guilty of such a slander upon Lower Canada.<sup>88</sup> He was well aware of the fact that a great many people were every year endeavouring to excite the prejudices of the farmers of Lower Canada against the school system, because it carried with it taxation, but luckily for the cause of education, that feeling was fast disappearing, and giving place to a more liberal and enlightened policy. There was only one parish in Lower Canada that had not an elementary school.<sup>89</sup> That parish was in the County of Yamaska, a County formerly represented by Mr. Forquin, but that gentleman, because he had endeavored to oppose the School Bill, had been rejected at last election, and an other member put in his place who had mere enlightened views on that matter. The hon. member then read an extract from the New York Herald, referring to the education of Lower Canada, and passing a high eulogium on the exertions which had been made. He stated that in his own County, the County of Verchères, two or three years ago one of the Seigniors wanted all his censitaires to take out new titles from him, and out of 140<sup>90</sup> farmers,<sup>91</sup> only three could not write their own names, and this might be stated in regard to many other Counties in Lower Canada.<sup>92</sup> In regard to the question of a Normal School for Lower Canada, he had already mentioned that the government had determined to establish such an institution there, if the House would grant the necessary appropriation of money for that purpose. Arrangements for that purpose had already been made, but they could not be carried out until the money was voted to carry them out. That was all he could say in regard to this subject now.<sup>93</sup> If no mention had been made of education in the speech it was not because the Government objected to the progress of education in Lower Canada. This House knew very well that it had not been in the power of the Administration to establish Normal Schools in Lower Canada, because they could not do so of their own authority. They intended, however, to establish three Normal Schools in Lower Canada--<sup>94</sup>

MR. WILSON: Why three? (Hear, hear.)<sup>95</sup>

[MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER] thanked the hon. member for London for taking so deep an interest in Lower Canada matters. He was pleased at the friendly enquiry and would tell him why three were required--(hear, hear).<sup>96</sup> [OR] The member will know when the money is asked for.<sup>97</sup> He wished to state for the information of the supporters of the Administration that the Government intended immediately to establish Normal Schools in Lower Canada, as soon as the necessary supplies were voted. The hon. member for Montreal stated that 10,000L had been appropriated some years ago for this purpose; but he would tell that hon. gentleman that he had prevented the Government carrying out that measure because he voted that the unclaimed

balances of the school moneys and the unappropriated funds of the Jesuit[s] Estates should be appropriated for the encouragement of superior education in Lower Canada.<sup>98</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--Who brought the estimates down? Did I?<sup>99</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--You voted the money away.<sup>100</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--Did I vote for the estimates? (Laughter.)<sup>101</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--You voted for the money in the way I say, and ought not, therefore, now to reproach the government with the omission from the speech in reference to the Normal schools.<sup>102</sup> He (Mr. Cartier) was of opinion that no money should be spent at the present time in building school houses.<sup>103</sup> In regard to the purchase which was made by the late Commissioner of Public Works of a site for the Normal School at Montreal, no more injudicious purchase could have been made. He did not blame the member from Montreal (Hon. Mr. Young) who was a member of the Board of Public Works at that time for this purchase, as he undoubtedly thought he was acting for the best. The intention of the Government was, since the purchase was made, to use it temporarily until some better place for the purpose could be procured. He was of the opinion that money ought not to be expended in the construction of a building, but rather in instruction.<sup>104</sup> The Government would therefore, for the present, endeavor to find suitable temporary accom[m]odations in Montreal and Quebec for these schools, and when the proper time arrived permanent houses might be constructed.<sup>105</sup> He would revert a moment to the position of his friend from Lincoln (Mr. Merritt) and there was no man for whom he had a greater respect. That member ought to know very well that the first time he (Mr. Cartier) had the honor of occupying a seat with him in the House of Assembly, when the Parliament was held in Montreal, he (Mr. Cartier) defended that hon. gentleman, when he was attacked for his advocacy of the Welland Canal on the ground that it would involve an appropriation of money for the benefit of Upper Canada, and he also rose and stated that it was an enterprise not redounding alone to the benefit of Upper Canada, but that it would prove of very great benefit to the interests of Lower Canada, because it would bring the trade and products of the farmers to the sea-ports of Montreal and Quebec. He contended at that time while the construction of the work was going on, that great benefit would ensue to the citizens of both Lower and Upper Canada, and that a permanent benefit would result to Lower Canada. Any work of public improvement constructed in the upper country which was conducive (sic) in facilitating the transit of the products of the west to the sea-board, would to a certain extent benefit Lower Canada. Upon one occasion he (Mr. Cartier) had stated to the honorable gentleman from Lincoln, that he need not trouble himself about having a monument erected to him after his death, that the Welland Canal would be as good a monument to his memory, as the Erie Canal was to the memory of De Witt Clinton.<sup>106</sup> In reverting to the trade resulting to Montreal, it would be remembered that a large amount of duties were received on the transit of the immense quantities of wheat which was conveyed thence from the western granaries, and when our commercial relations were changed between the two countries in 1843, it would not for a moment have been supposed that such an immense trade would have arisen up, and the increase of the trade on that canal had proved, that the hon. gentleman was not too sanguine in the speculations which he had formed of its advantages.<sup>107</sup> In other respects, however, the member for Lincoln complained that the trade was leaving the country. So far it did so, because it had been formerly built by tariffs. It seemed, however, that the trade questions were to be transferred from the member for

Lincoln to the member for Montreal, who was certainly quite acquainted with all the trade of the country. That gentleman had published a report in favor of the Caughnawaga Canal, but the effect of his reasoning was to convince him (Mr. Cartier) not that the plan would counteract the interests of New York, but would build up their interests. The merchants of Montreal would have only the pleasure of seeing the trade pass by them to Lake Champlain. Now, that scheme might increase the tolls on the canals, but it would not add to the aggregate of the trade of Montreal or Quebec. He mentioned this because he supposed these canals one of the improvements referred to in amendment of the opposition.<sup>108</sup> The honorable gentleman then commented at some length upon the commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, and spoke in conclusion substantially as follows:--The honorable gentleman from Lincoln should remember that the Erie Canal has proved a failure compared with the railroad. He remarked that he had in his possession the Report of the Auditor of the Canal, recommending tolls on the Railroad so as to allow of the Canal favorably competing with it. If this course was not adopted, it was strongly hinted that the Canal would have recourse to direct taxation to pay its way. The honorable gentleman says that the State of New York will have none of the debt of the Canal to pay. He would not say that he was wrong in the assertion, but he would ask him to compare the report with him. The state of the finances of the Erie Canal was so bad that by their Constitution of 1846 they had a sinking fund of \$1,300,000 to pay besides the interest on the debt.<sup>109</sup> [OR] The debt at that time was \$1,800,000, besides an amount of \$200,000 which they had to pay towards the expenses of the State of New York. The great success of the Erie Canal ought not to alarm the people of this Province; and we need not fear that New York would cut us out in trade.<sup>110</sup> Again, the hon. gentleman from Montreal seems to have forgotten the fact that the trade of New York is not so great as it was formerly in proportion to the number of inhabitants. Five years ago the population was 500,000. By the census of 1855 it was a little more than 600,000. They expected to attain to 750,000. Notwithstanding this the trade of New York is not as great as it was formerly. And why? Because it has competitors for the home and foreign trade. Boston with its ocean steamers and numerous lines of railroad, Philadelphia with her railroads and the trade of Lake Erie, and, to a certain extent, New Orleans are all competitors for the trade which formerly centred at New York. The speaker said he did not like the idea of there being no hope for us. He well knew that the trade of Montreal or Quebec was not as great as it should be. He well knew that this was owing in a great measure to the depression of the lumber trade. But he did not consider things were in a desperate condition. He well knew that Montreal had not half the trade which the honourable member from Montreal wished. However, he believed that there was more real commercial enterprise in Montreal than ever before.<sup>111</sup> She was still the finest city in British North America<sup>112</sup>. Montreal was a city with 75,000 inhabitants, and it could not be expected that it would compete all at once with a city containing a population of 620,000. Its commercial sufferings were momentary, and must decrease in proportion as its commercial capital increased. In justice to the commercial member for Montreal (Hon. Mr. Young) he must apologize for having so long detained him from addressing the House on a subject with which he was so familiar. The hon. member then sat down, after having spoken for about two hours.<sup>113</sup>

MR. A. DORION, (Montreal,) said he did not rise for the purpose of answering the rather extraordinary speech, which had been delivered by the Provincial Secretary, but he thought he had a right to give some explanations in regard to certain extraordinary assertions he had made, as to what he (Mr. Dorion) had said. The hon. gentleman had repeated three or four times, that he (Mr. D.) had slandered Montreal and the people of Lower Canada. If saying, on the authority of the reports which he

held in his hand, that out of 275,000 children of school age in Lower Canada, only 119,000 attended school, if saying that was slandering the people of Lower Canada, he admitted that he had done so. But he denied that he had ever stated, as was asserted, that the population of Lower Canada were steeped in ignorance, or that they were in a state of deep ignorance. He had said no such thing. But he had said that the course taken by the Administration, in not establishing a Model School, in not giving additional aid to Common Schools, and in keeping 150,000 children without the means of education, was the most likely course they could adopt to heap ignorance and disgrace on the people of Lower Canada.--(Hear, hear.) That was a very different thing from his having slandered the people of Lower Canada, or his having said that they were steeped in ignorance. On another point he wished to correct the Hon. Provincial Secretary. He had charged himself and his friends with bringing down estimates which diverted to superior educational institutions the sources of revenue which should have gone to Common Schools and Normal Schools.<sup>114</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--I stated that he and his friends should have found fault when the supplies were submitted to the House, containing no items relating to Normal Schools, but that during two successive sessions, the hon. member has voted away for the encouragement of superior education in Lower Canada, all the sources of revenue which could have gone to Normal Schools.<sup>115</sup>

MR. A. DORION said the hon. gentleman might give any explanation he thought proper. But the statement he first made was that he (Mr. Dorion) was the cause of having voted away for the Colleges the money appropriated to Normal Schools, as if he was responsible for estimates brought down by the administration, backed by a large majority of the house. But even on the explanation that he had merely voted with the others, he was willing to accept the issue, and to shew the Hon. Provincial Secretary that he was wrong. When the estimates were brought down, making over the unappropriated balances of the Jesuits' Estates' Fund to Colleges--for the encouragement of that superior education which those who got could afford to pay for--he was one of those who spoke and voted against it. (Hear, hear.) He went the length of moving a resolution to give those unappropriated balances to the Common Schools. (Hear, hear.) Even if he had not moved that resolution, he was not bound to have known that that was the money appropriated to Normal Schools, by the law which the administration disregarded, and he did not know anything of it. But even not knowing that, he opposed himself to the proposition brought down by the administration to give that money to the Colleges of Lower Canada, and might say Colleges which in some instances had no existence at all, but had money granted them for the purpose of favouring some of the friends of the ministry. On the 22nd May, on the question being proposed that the house do concur in the Supply Resolutions, Mr. J.B.E. Dorion, seconded by Mr. Papin, moved that the Report of the Committee of Supply be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, to resolve, that all the monies appropriated for the several Academies, and Superior Schools be handed over to the Common School Fund, to be distributed among the School Municipalities in the ratio of their population. (Hear, hear.) The members who voted for that were not numerous, but their numbers they believed would soon be increased, and in the course of one or two sessions even hon. gentlemen on the other side would ... not dare to prevent the increase of the Common School Fund, by voting all the available funds to Colleges. They knew that although the Administration voted down the Bill of the honorable member for Chambly, requiring returns from all educational institutions receiving public grants, they were shortly afterwards compelled to bring in the same measure themselves, and he did not despair of seeing them vote, if not for the same, for a similar motion to that he had just read, because public opinion would compel

them to do so. The yeas on that motion were Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, J.B.E. Dorion, A.A. Dorion, (Hear, hear) Hartman, and others, twelve in all. Among those who voted nay, he found the name of the Hon. Provincial Secretary, Cartier, giving away the proceeds of the Jesuits' Estates to the prejudice of the Common Schools. If all the facts stated about the trade of the country were as correct as that, he did not think his hon. colleagues, to whom the Provincial Secretary had paid so many compliments for his clear views and accurate knowledge of everything relating to trade and commerce, would have much difficulty in answering the long and elaborate speech of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman had three or four times repeated most unjustly, that he (Mr. D.) had slandered his countrymen. The sensitiveness of the hon. gentleman appeared to be much greater than it had been for some time past. He knew some instances in which the hon. gentleman was not so sensitive, or so ready to cry out that there were slanderers of the people of Lower Canada, when perhaps there was more cause for it. He had not risen to make another speech, but simply to correct erroneous statements. He had not slandered his countrymen, but he could not conceal the truth, that their education had not been taken proper care of by the administration of the country, who should have done it. That truth, were it ten times more unpalatable to his countrymen of Lower Canada, he would speak out fearlessly, if he expected that he could do any good by it.<sup>116</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER quoted the Act 14 and 15 Victoria, to shew that the sum of 1,500L, to be put yearly at the disposal of the Government, for the establishment of a Normal School in Lower Canada, was to be taken out of the unappropriated balances of the Common Schools, and Jesuits' Estates. The hon. member for Montreal, (Mr. Dorion,) as a lawyer, must have known that, and he repeated that that hon. member had voted away those sources of revenue for the purpose of encouraging superior education in Lower Canada<sup>117</sup>--the sums thus voted away amounting to 6,000L.<sup>118</sup> He had quoted from the journals of the House, to show that he had opposed the vote. But he only opposed the manner, wanting to have the money distributed in another way according to the number of the pupils, but he had not opposed the thing itself, but had voted for the Supply Bill making those grants to the Superior Educational Institutions. He might say that he did not know that the balances were so appropriated, but as a lawyer he should have known it.<sup>119</sup>

MR. A. DORION said that as a lawyer he did not know it.<sup>120</sup>

MR. YOUNG regretted that he should have been so pointedly referred to by the hon. member for Lincoln, (Mr. Merritt), for, however well he might understand the subject, he feared that he would fail in giving expression to his views as he would wish to do. He was one of those who thought, that the subject of trade and commerce, should have received at the hands of the Government, more than the meagre notice it had received in the speech from the Throne. In England and in the whole of the States of the Union, the subject of trade and commerce occupied the attention of their best minds, and whatever tended to cheapen transit, was deemed a subject of the greatest importance. He intended briefly to glance at the present state and future prospects of the trade of Canada, and in connexion with that, to enquire what evidence they had in the Address of attention being given to these subjects by the Government. Previous to 1847, the whole of the trade of Canada was forced through the St. Lawrence to Montreal and Quebec. Under the Imperial duty then existing, Upper Canada could neither import through the United States, nor could she export any of her produce by that route. The changed commercial policy of England, then enabled Upper Canada by the withdrawal of differential duties, to export produce in bond, through the United States. The canals of Canada were finished in 1849, and

although the wheat admitted from the United States, and ground into flour in the Lower Province, swelled the receipts at tide-water there, yet the gross receipts did not enable them to compete successfully with the United States. But the whole of this trade had been changed by the effect of Reciprocity, which not only enabled the Upper Canada producer to send his produce through the United States in bond for export, but opened to him the markets of the United States for consumption. Every facility was now given for the export of the produce of Western Canada, not only for export from New York or Boston, but also for consumption. Then look at the results. The receipts of this season in Montreal were of flour 433,000 barrels, of wheat 634,000 bushels, and of corn 620,000 bushels; representing altogether 3,421,000 bushels, and of this amount there were exported only 341,000 bushels, all the remainder, more than 3 millions, being taken for the food of the people of Lower Canada. And it was evident that property must continue to flow from the West through the United States, unless some superior channels were opened. The present state of the trade of the St. Lawrence was the more alarming, when they knew that the State of New York was not to confine herself to her present channel of communication, but was going to enlarge the capacity of her canals very materially, so that unless some measures were devised by the Canadian Government for the increase of our means of transport, we would not be able to remain, even as much as at present, the carriers of our own produce.<sup>121</sup> Mr. Young here sat suddenly down, explaining that he felt ill, and some other member would probably occupy the floor while he recruited.<sup>122</sup>

MR. HARTMAN felt it necessary to reply to some of the remarks of the Hon. Provincial Secretary. He understood that hon. gentleman to say, that in Upper Canada there was a certain per centage of the pupils attending the Grammar Schools who were not able to read and write. He took the liberty at the time to dissent, and to say that the hon. gentleman must be alluding to the Gaoler's Report as to the state of education in the gaol. Such was his impression at the time, but he had since discovered the source of the Provincial Secretary's mistake. Under the old Grammar School system, not now in force, but superseded by the Act of 1853, it was true that there were admitted into some of the Grammar Schools, pupils who could not read or write. But he had understood the hon. gentleman to say, that that was the case in reference to these Schools now. In the report for 1854 he found it stated that under the old system there were 33 per cent of the schools that received pupils unable to read. And that was not the per centage of pupils, as stated by the Provincial Secretary, but the per centage of schools that received such pupils, a very, very different thing. (Hear, hear.) Under the old system the Grammar Schools were in many instances made use of by persons who did not wish to send their children to the Common Schools, but under the system now in operation, no pupils could under the Act be admitted, who were not able to read intelligently and correctly; and it was necessary that they should know certain rules of arithmetic, and be acquainted with the elements of grammar and the outlines of geography. The hon. Provincial Sec'y was therefore greatly mistaken in the statement he had made. He would not say that the hon. gentleman had slandered the Grammar Schools of Upper Canada, as that word had been too extensively used to-night, where it should not have been, but he was surprised that the hon. gentleman, occupying the position he did, did not know that the document from which he quoted referred to a state of things long since done away with. (Hear, hear.) There was another remark made by the hon. gentleman, and he took care to say that the fact had come to his knowledge officially, that one Grammar School in Upper Canada was about to be suspended, because it had only one pupil. He would have liked him had the hon. gentleman been now in his place, to state officially the official reason for that state of things.

As he was not in his place, he (Mr. H.) would state them not officially. That Grammar School was located in a place where it happened that the majority of the Controlling Board were of one religious persuasion, and the great majority of the community were of another, and a good deal of difference of opinion existed among the people as to the management of schools. The Grammar School was conducted in a way that the majority of the community did not approve of. The parents in that section had been prohibited from sending their children, and the consequence was that there was but one pupil. The Common Schools there were under the control of one section, and the Grammar School under the control of another who happened to be a small minority of the population, and that was the reason for the fact stated by the hon. gentleman, who, he was sorry, was not in his place to give it officially. He would not now enter into a comparison of the systems of education in Upper and Lower Canada, which might perhaps be entered into with great advantage, as whatever had been gained by either section of the Province, the other should be glad to profit by. Upper Canada had its school system organised in 1841, at which time 50,000L was set apart for Common Schools in Upper and Lower Canada. Of that amount, 21,000L went to Upper Canada, and 29,000L to Lower Canada, according to the then population of the two sections, and that proportion continued till 1850. Since then, there had been nearly an equal division. He mentioned the fact that for nine years a considerable difference existed in the sums received by the two sections of the Province, but he left it to hon. gentlemen, such as the Provincial Secretary, who were better acquainted with the facts as to the progress made in the two sections, to draw out the comparison between the state of education in Upper and Lower Canada respectively.<sup>123</sup>

MR. YOUNG again rose and made several statistical statements sending to show the great falling off in the trade of Montreal, and the great success of its rivals.<sup>124</sup> In the speech, allusion was made to the fact that the timber trade of Montreal had declined and that was all.<sup>125</sup> During the last year 128,000 bushels of grain have been transported through Lower Canada against 1,115,000 through Oswego. However prosperous the trade in Upper Canada may be, the people of Lower Canada are deprived of many facilities for trade. For this there is no remedy except in public improvements. The hon. Provincial Secretary thinks it an unfortunate state of things. Yet the Government suggest no improvement by which this state of things may be remedied. The people of Lower Canada would feel better on the subject if they had the ability to transport their merchandize and other freight through the great natural channel of the St. Lawrence, and receive also through the same medium of communication their imports. The speaker was of opinion that even Upper Canada would rejoice at the successful accomplishment of this object. During the last year, Lower Canada has paid no less than 125,000L for freight through the States which might, under other circumstances, have passed through channels of communication within her own limits.<sup>126</sup> He would like to ask the members of Government and every hon. member of this House how it was possible to do away with this state of things. Now property can be removed from Toronto to Boston or New York, at a lower rate than it can be carried to Lower Canada. He thought it important then that the great public works of this country should be made available. It was of great importance that the interest of these large sums expended on public works amounting (sic) to 225,000L should be saved in the country if it possibly could be saved, and no effort should be spared by Government to investigate the subject.<sup>127</sup> There is an urgent necessity for the immediate improvement of the St. Lawrence, and this is the more necessary on account of the vast sums expended on the railroads of the country. It has been said that railroads are to be the great channels for our commerce. But gentlemen should consider that the two hundred and fifty miles now built do not carry merchandize to

a market for sale. Why, the rate of charge<sup>128</sup> from Montreal to Portland was fifty cents per barrel for 292 miles,<sup>129</sup> and the line to Toronto will, when completed, impose a tariff rate of 60 cents, which, railroad men of experience say, is by no means high.<sup>130</sup> He would contend that by such a rate<sup>131</sup> this railroad cannot compete with the St. Lawrence mode of transit if the latter is properly opened. But now goods, instead of seeking a market through our waters, are transported to Oswego whence they are distributed over the United States. Now contrast, for a moment, a few facts on the subject. In 1855, 34,000,000 bushels of corn passed through the New York lines of transportation, whereas only 3,000,000 passed by the St. Lawrence. It is our policy to attract this carrying trade to the St. Lawrence as a channel of transport. Yet on this very important subject we hear no notice or suggestion from the government. In Lower Canada every branch of trade is at a stand still. Our imports from the West have fallen fifty per cent<sup>132</sup> during the last two years,<sup>133</sup> and they will continue to fall unless a remedy is provided. The honorable Secretary speaks of a canal to unite the waters of the St. Lawrence with those of Lake Champlain. The importance of this is manifest. We must also enlarge the Welland canal. The amount of transportation from the west is increasing so rapidly that any amount of expenditure would be well employed to attract that trade.<sup>134</sup> He found that in 1835 the trade from the West, arriving by tide-water, was 1,417,000 bushels, while in 1845 it had increased to 8,000,000 and this year it was 24,000,000 bushels--and when they considered the immense amount of that territory, and what that country is to become, he held it to be of the utmost importance that every means should be taken to oompete (*sic*) with the State of New York for that trade.<sup>135</sup> It is now ten years since this canal was first spoken of. Petitions have been sent in from the Boards of Trade and from merchants and others in favour of this object. Yet nothing has been done.<sup>136</sup> The Provincial Secretary stated that he was a Montreal man and that he wanted the trade to go to Montreal because it was the finest city in British North America. Yet he was against<sup>137</sup> the St. Lawrence and Champlain Canal<sup>138</sup>, because it would not take the trade down that way. He (Mr. Young) was of a contrary opinion, and he thought that when ths (*sic*) Government of the country came to investigate the matter they would find that the canal had got to be constructed, and that its construction would be the only means by which the vast trade of the West could be brought to Lower Canada.<sup>139</sup> Mr. Young here again excused himself on account of indisposition, and stated he would return to the subject again.<sup>140</sup>

MR. BELLINGHAM said he was glad to see an earnest desire to encourage education. It may suit the views of some to sneer at the American system of education. There is no doubt but their system is admirably adapted to advance in the best possible manner the cause of education. It takes a child at the first stage of his schooling and leads him up step by step through all the gradations of a finished education. And if Canadians wish to give their sons a finished education they send them to the United States.<sup>141</sup> His (Mr. B's) country was peculiarly situated, containing a poor population of Protestants, surrounded by French Canadian Catholics; they however, appreciated and earnestly sought to enjoy the advantages of education had in the States.<sup>142</sup> When the American Government had organized new territories, their practice was to set apart large tracts of land for public schools.<sup>143</sup> We have nothing of the kind here.<sup>144</sup> The money obtained from the confiscation of the Clergy Reserves should have been devoted to educational purposes. The Seminary of St. Sulpice which possessed large revenues derived from gifts of the Crown was also bound to educate the ignorant of all classes and feed the poor as a condition of their charter. With regard to public improvements,<sup>145</sup> the speaker said that he wished God speed to the public works. They should not be mixed up with party or

sectional feeling. Their discussion should be thrown open to the House and each member should support or oppose the measures according to their views of the case. The honorable gentleman from Montreal tries to show that the trade should go through the St. Lawrence. He believed that there were certain great natural avenues of travel, and of these the route by the Lakes was the shortest. The only way to meet this obstacle to our advancement is to open up similar means of transit.<sup>146</sup> It was idle to attempt to compete for a portion of the trade with the New York channels. The natural route for this portion of the West was via the State of New York. But all water home traffic from Lake Michigan Westward would find its natural channel through the Valley of the Ottawa. Men in the Senate of New York had concurred in this view with respect to the Ottawa Valley.<sup>147</sup> If we cut the Ottawa Canal we shall take away from the American trade because we can offer expedition, shortness in route and cheap rates of carriage as inducements for the trade. If we can open up this Ottawa Canal it is absolutely certain that we must command the trade of the West. Such is the amount of trade on the New York Central Railroad that over 2,000 carters are employed in the mere transportation of goods across the Hudson. And there is now nearly 600,000 tons of freight waiting for the opening of navigation.<sup>148</sup> He concurred in the view of the hon. member for Montreal that railways could not compete with canals for heavy freights. The wear and tear was very great and the rates charged too small to meet this extra expense.--Means were got to build the Sault St[e]. Marie Canal by Mr. Whitney, its projector, by getting Congress to give a grant of land. The Ottawa Canal might be so constructed; it would be necessary to reach it by means of a canal from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain; that he believed, would not materially affect Montreal in any way, but was necessary as an outlet for the Ottawa lumber and Western produce seeking the Atlantic States. Orders for lumber from China to New York, were before now, executed on the Ottawa. West of the Matawan, too, a large trade would be done in lumber, which would be sent to the Western prairies.<sup>149</sup> Our object in building the Ottawa canal is that lumber may be loaded and transported to the sea port towns of the United States without transhipment. We have here in the Ottawa country almost the only forest on the continent. The forests in the northern states are fast disappearing. In twenty years we on the Ottawa will have almost the only supply of timber available. The aid of Government has been given to railroads which have not benefitted the people.<sup>150</sup> He ... proceeded to argue in favor of the North Shore Railroad, holding that, after fixing the site of the bridge at Montreal, a railway on the north side became a necessity.<sup>151</sup> The speaker alluded to the isolated situation of the Ottawa country, and their difficulty of access to Montreal during the winter season. The speaker said that were a railroad built in every county it would not bring out native industry.<sup>152</sup> All railways and canals possible, would not develop our resources unless our industry were properly protected.<sup>153</sup> The United States takes our young men. They go to a land where industry is protected.<sup>154</sup> Ore was dug in Hull, and sent to the States to be smelted; butts of trees were gathered together, and sent there to be manufactured into matches and sent back here. Why was this? Because of our mistaken commercial policy. Our salmon (sic) fisheries are also being destroyed. They might be made a most profitable branch of industry. Our canals were not paying, nor would they pay until a new policy was preserved with regard to the commerce of the country.<sup>155</sup> As soon as you establish protection here you will see manufactures and all other branches of industry flourishing.<sup>156</sup>

MR. STEVENSON followed in a few remarks, advocating the encouragement of native industry. But this must be accomplished by degrees.<sup>157</sup> The growth of manufactures must be slow; they should not be forced like hot-house plants.<sup>158</sup> What more could Ministers do than they have done? They have made a canal whose rates are extremely

low.--This low rate had been done for the encouragement of the river trade.<sup>159</sup> It was unfair to blame ministers for that which the merchants of Montreal deserved in like manner. When Canada had advantages in the British market the Upper Canada trade went there. He was sorry to see the trade diverted from the St. Lawrence. He hoped to see the day when the produce of the whole valley of the St. Lawrence would go down its river<sup>160</sup>. The merchants of Montreal had never recommended any practical measure to draw trade that way. They could not expect the farmers in Upper Canada to send their grain to Montreal at 9s per bushel, when they could get 10s over the lake. Of late years, the United States had taken and consumed cereals; but this would not always be so, and<sup>161</sup> he believed that the St. Lawrence route was destined soon to be a great medium of transport for western trade to the sea.... The speaker alluded briefly to the subject of Grammar Schools.<sup>162</sup>

MR. THIBAUDEAU defended the system of education in Lower Canada (speaking at great length in French).<sup>163</sup> Les membres du Bas-Canada doivent de la reconnaissance à l'hon. membre de Verchères pour la façon triomphante dont il a répondu au membre pour Montréal. Assurément les habitants français du Bas-Canada trouveront une bien faible cause de satisfaction dans les paroles prononcées ce soir par le membre pour Montréal, et ils n'auront guère sujet de le remercier d'avoir, pour ainsi parler, donné raison aux paroles attribuées naguères à un personnage haut placé. Certaine expression trouvée, nous assure-t-on, dans le discours prononcé par Son Excellence, le gouverneur-général, à Hamilton, fut dans le temps bruyamment blâmée par quelques personnes intéressées à amener à ce sujet le peuple du Bas-Canada. Mais ces paroles, eussent-elles été réellement prononcées par le gouverneur, ce qui n'a jamais été établi, seraient moins injurieuses, beaucoup moins blessantes, sortant de la bouche d'un étranger, peu au fait de l'état social de notre peuple, que ne l'est la peinture faite ce soir par le membre pour Montréal, que cette peinture soit d'ailleurs remplie ou non de fausses ombres.

Assurément l'hon. membre n'a pas le droit de se plaindre si l'on considère son langage comme bien plus blessant que celui qu'on attribuait à un étranger, et s'il est vrai de dire: "Dis-moi qui tu hantes et je te dirai qui tu es," quelle opinion peut-on se faire d'un Canadien-Français que l'on voit confondu dans les rangs où se trouve le membre pour Lambton et dont l'organe le plus bruyant est le Globe, cet ennemi acharné de la nationalité franco-canadienne et de la religion professée par la majorité des habitants du Bas-Canada?<sup>164</sup> The hon. gentleman then proceeded to argue that education in Lower Canada had progressed of late years, and was not in so low a state as some would have it supposed.<sup>165</sup>

MR. GALT said that in looking at the resolutions, he did not think there was any matter in them deserving of detaining the House from its important duties. The principal subjects embraced in them were those on which the House had already legislated; and they would probably be detained two or three days, discussing matters which would have to be discussed over again afterwards, when the measures were brought before them. Indeed,<sup>166</sup> if the Government had not put some of the clauses of the Address in such a form as called upon the House to endorse their policy, it might, in his opinion, have been as well to have let the Address pass without proposing any amendment. But he agreed with the member from Montreal that the omissions from the Speech constituted perhaps a more important part than what it contained. The amendment referred to several most important subjects which he could scar[c]ely think the Government could have lost sight of, but which it was evident they did not intend to bring before the House this Session, although when they looked at the anxiety the country felt on these questions, they were entitled to

expect something in regard to them from the Government. On the question of education he did not intend to say a word, as it had been the subject of so much debate to-night, and the fact that the debate had nearly altogether turned on that question, was the best coincidence they could have of the interest that was taken in it. On the subject of internal improvements, some statement might have been expected from the Government.<sup>167</sup> He could easily understand the difficulty which a government, constituted as this is, would have in dealing with such question as the North Shore Railroad. It might be inconvenient to bring such a topic before the House, inasmuch as a great number of persons in the Lower Provi[n]ce were deeply interested in the subject. But<sup>168</sup> he was at a loss to understand why a Government commanding a large majority of the House--at least they might presume so from the divisions of last session--had neglected to take up these subjects. He could find no other reason than that the Cabinet itself was devoid of those bonds of union which would permit of their dealing with those great questions. It would appear too from the ministerial papers that there was an important change taking place in the sentiments of some of the followers of the gallant Knight. It appeared there had been a caucus meeting of a portion of them yesterday, and he presumed they would be moving amendments on the clause relating to the Legislative Council. (Hear, hear.) He believed, therefore, that the absence of legislation on these matters was rather due to the want of union in the ministerial ranks, than to any want of appreciation on their part of their importance. On the question of the Ottawa route for example, a number of the ministerial supporters, at a public meeting, not very properly he thought, pointed to some sort of engagement to make their political support contingent on the Government taking up certain improvements. By taking decided action, the Government might have alienated the support of some of those gentlemen who now had confidence in them. But, looking at the state of the Province generally, looking at the possible future before it, he thought it desirable that the Government should be able to deal with these questions, without consulting the opinion of every one who happened to be their supporter for the time being. He was glad to learn that the diminution in the revenue of the Province was not greater than the Inspecfor (sic) General had calculated it would have been. But he was afraid there was not much hope of its being very soon materially augmented, for the trade in the eastern portion of the Province was in that depressed state that it would take some time to revive. It was manifest, however, that there was a likelihood of a very large and important charge coming upon the revenue of the country, one which must have engaged the attention of the Inspector General. There was a very large amount of indirect liability assumed by the Province, in the loans made ... [to] the various Municipalities throughout the country, and he believed the Government were now obliged to contemplate putting some of the most stringent clauses of the law in force, in order to compel them to meet their liabilities. He had always held the opinion that that indirect liability of the Province would end in a direct liability, and was certain that the Inspector General would have to pay the interest on those bonds when they fell due, being the bonds of the Province. He understood that there was a disposition on the part of some of the Municipalities to resist the payment, and he understood that there were also some good grounds for such a course.<sup>169</sup> In some cases these bonds had been issued, at all events, in opposition to the law<sup>170</sup>. If, then, it was the fact, that the Province had to assume at no distant day, or had even to make a temporary provision for two and a half millions of money, in addition to its present debt, it was a serious matter, and the House were entitled to expect from the Government some intimation of their policy in regard to it. He was not prepared to say, that in times of financial difficulty the improvement of public works should be carried on, but he was prepared to say, that

the present period was a proper one for asserting (sic) the practicability of some of those enterprises which were now being discussed. There could have been no harm in the government holding out the hope that at some future time when the finances would allow, they would undertake these public works. When they considered that the debt of the Province amounted to 10 or 12 millions sterling, direct or indirect, he felt that it was quite possible, if the trade and commerce of the country did not revive, that the whole interest on that amount might fall on the consolidated fund, and in that case it was the duty of the government to have made some reference to that important subject, and been prepared with some policy, holding out some hope of giving such a revenue as would support the credit of the country. Probably the Inspector General would say, that he was prepared to meet all the liabilities of the country. He trusted it would be so, but he conceived it would have been satisfactory to have known, that the government had in contemplation and were prepared, if necessary, to ask the House for such powers as would enable them to meet those difficulties. And moreover when they considered that the whole of that 10 or 12 millions of money had been expended in public improvements, and when they coupled with that the views of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Young) in reference to the importance of further improving the internal communications of the country, in order to create a revenue from those works, and to avoid the risk of having to pay the whole of that debt unremunerated, he thought the subject of internal improvements should on that account have occupied a prominent place in the speech from the Throne.<sup>171</sup> Again, as to the trade of the country, they had last year been visited by the French Commandant M. De Belveze,<sup>172</sup> on behalf of the Emperor of France<sup>173</sup>, for the purpose of establishing commercial intercourse between France and Canada. Such, at least, he understood was the purport of the French Commandant's visit. Now, if such was the case, it was a matter which would have a very important effect on the interests of the Province. And as such, it ought to have been referred to<sup>174</sup> in the Speech. Knowing the majority that ministers had at their disposal, he had not the least expectation of the amendments being carried, although he must say that he would be very glad if they were, for he would be delighted to see the hon. and gallant knight again on that side of the house, to give them the benefit of his experience, in correcting the measures of those holding office. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It would also be a subject of gratulation to him if he found that the learned member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron) either in reference to the Legislative Council or on account of personal grievances, was taking up a more independent position than he had hitherto occupied, for then there would be a probability of the Coalition, which had severed so much the ranks of the Liberal party, being ultimately broken up.<sup>175</sup> In conclusion he expressed a hope that the Inspector General, would give them some account of the position of the Provincial Finances.<sup>176</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY replied to some remarks of the previous speaker<sup>177</sup>, but was very indistinctly heard in the gallery.<sup>178</sup> He said that that hon'ble member had spoken of the large debt, direct and indirect, of the Province, but he remembered a magnificent report which appeared in the London papers two or three years ago<sup>179</sup>, at the time his hon. friend (Mr. Galt) and the Hon. Mr. Ross were in England<sup>180</sup>, as to the immense revenue to be derived from the Grand Trunk, particularly from Montreal to Portland, and now they were told that it would not pay the cost.<sup>181</sup>

MR. GALT.--My reference was, not to the Grand Trunk, but to the Municipal Loans.<sup>182</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY insisted that the Grand Trunk Debentures formed a portion of the indirect liabilities of the Province alluded to by the hon'ble gentleman.

And he was sorry that even for the purpose of supporting what he must term an unsupportable amendment, anything should have been said which would have the effect of shaking the credit of the Province.<sup>183</sup> With respect to what had been said about the depressed condition of the trade of the country, by the hon. member for Montreal, Mr. Young, owing to that gentleman's indisposition, no doubt, he had not made himself quite clearly understood, but he, Mr. Cayley, understood him to attribute the decline of trade to the throwing off of the trammels imposed upon commerce in '46, and the consummation of the Reciprocity Treaty last year. The hon. member had himself with his fellow merchants in Montreal, been the first to hail with satisfaction the removal of the restrictions on trade; he, (Mr. C.) was satisfied that you could not force back the trade into old channels by setting up artificial barriers to prevent its seeking its natural outlet.<sup>184</sup> He remembered when the imports of Kingston were 20,000L, and those of Toronto and Hamilton were very small; now the imports of Toronto were 160,000L or 170,000L.<sup>185</sup> It was reversed. Should they undertake to draw back the trade of Kingston?<sup>186</sup> He remembered when Stamford (sic) showed returns for 20,000L, and London nothing; while at the present time London has returned 24,000L. He remembered that one time Niagara was the centre of business and the seat of government; but Niagara had yielded to Toronto.<sup>187</sup> Should they devise means to force back trade to those old channels?<sup>188</sup> He had no doubt that Montreal would speedily recover from the temporary check which it had sustained; but it would not be by any forced Legislation.<sup>189</sup> The better way was to leave these things to take their natural route.<sup>190</sup> Going back still further upon the proposed amendment to the resolutions he would say that he fully concurred in what had fallen from his hon. friend, the Provincial Secretary, he could now understand why so much time was required to prepare these amendments. They have endeavored to be so cautious in the moving of their amendments that one would naturally believe they imagined they were preparing the speech itself rather than amendments to it. Why not state exactly what they meant to say, it (sic) they wished their amendments to be supported. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion) stated that no ministry ever went into power with more support both in the House and out of the House than the Baldwin Administration, and because they took no action upon the Seigniorial Tenure and upon the Clergy Reserves and upon Education in Lower Canada, they lost the support of the House and consequently failed. It seemed strange that the hon. member should speak of want of action on Educational matters when they had passed that measure by which the 24 Inspectors of Schools had been appointed, and the great advantage of their appointments had been shown by the Reports on the state of Education which had been so freely quoted this evening. The speech of the hon. member for Lincoln put him in mind of the speeches of former days. He was a member of an administration which is now all broken up, and was considered by his colleagues so visionary, so impracticable, that it was impossible to comprehend his schemes. Now he tells us that all that he wants is 12 feet of water upon two bars below the Coteau. They had been told also that they must have still further improvement upon the Welland Canal. There was no end to this expenditure, and after all they were told that freight was carried more cheaply from Toronto to New York than from Toronto to Montreal. Of what use then would be the expenditure on the Welland Canal. He could not help feeling that this attack upon the resolutions had been very lame in its commencement, and he had no doubt it would continue so throughout.<sup>191</sup> He pointed out that there was neither purpose nor method in the course pursued by the Opposition in moving their amendments. The explanations in reference to the finances of the country he could give at the proper time.<sup>192</sup>

MR. WILSON next addressed the House. He said: We are referred to the labors of last session, and congratulated upon having settled the disputed question of the

Clergy Reserves. I can discover no cause for congratulation. I fear the mode in which it has been settled will leave a lasting stain upon our public men. This House will remember, Sir, that when the present Ministry was formed, the hon. and gallant knight, and especially the hon. Attorney General, assured us that although they had always believed, and yet individually believed that the lands set apart for the maintenance of a clergy ought not to be taken for secular uses, yet the country had so emphatically declared against their views, that as statesmen they felt constrained no longer to oppose the voice of the country--and they declared they were ready and willing to carry the measure, which the retiring Ministry had prepared. We had the measure, and we had more than the measure, we had a Commutation clause, and more than a Commutation clause, we had the announcement that no individual should be allowed to commute without the consent of the Church to which he belonged. Immediately upon this announcement, we discovered those Churches to which a large part of the stipend was paid, had formed a scheme which would enable them, with the money received for the aggregate of the commutations, to pay the same stipends to the individual clergy which they had received, and leave, if not the whole fund, at least the greater part of it, as a perpetual endowment to these Churches. Now the fraud upon the country consists in this, that it declared against endowment, and yet Churches are endowed. The Ministry professed to abandon their individual views in deference to the expressed opinion of the country, but in fact by management in framing the Bill, and connivance with the Churches, they created endowments, against the opinion of the country. Our attention has been called to a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, to be under the control of the Crown. Honorable gentlemen seem to forget that before the time when Responsible Government was introduced, the existing policy was to centralize appointment and power in the Government, leaving only petty offices of Townships in the choice of the people. Since that period municipal institutions have been established, the right to elect officers extended, and the progress which the country has made since the change has been truly wonderful. The whole magic was this, the people were allowed to depend upon themselves and feel their own responsibility. But this proposed measure is retrograde. The true principle of good order and security is, that every man is bound to maintain the law and aid its enforcement. The ordinary peace officers have hitherto been quite sufficient to enforce the law, and I look upon the proposed measure with great alarm. What need is there of a constabulary force, appointed by and under the control of the executive Government? Is it to give the Government patronage? It has already too much. Does the Government apprehend riot at elections? It need not, and if it did, does any one who remembers the olden times need to be told how that force would be applied? I say, sir, that it will be dangerous to give the Government either the patronage or the power of such a force, and I say more, that the suggestion for its organization has arisen from no necessity, no call on the part of the country. Give the municipalities power if you please, to establish such a constabulary force as any individual locality may require; give them increased facilities for calling upon the community to aid officers of the peace; but give no power to any Government to control a force which may be used to subvert our liberties. We are reminded of our advance in civilization, and our extended lines of railway are adduced as proofs of it. Would that it were so. I fear, when the whole truth comes to be told, we shall find that the Grand Trunk originated in a wild scheme of speculation, and that all the loss and all the odium will fall upon Canada. As our million after million has been voted for it, we have been assured and reassured that the Government was safe in all its advances. How is it safe? Is it because the money advanced is the first mortgage on the road? I say no. It is because it has its first mortgage on the road that it must assume the whole responsibility. That it will not pay eastward from Montreal no one denies. That it will

pay as a whole, no one can assert. I venture to say that the most sanguine member in this House not interested in the scheme will not assert that it will pay the shareholders. And if it does not, this province must take the stock and pay the shareholders. Why, you ask? Because, Sir, this Government, by its members, by its acts, and by its being in the direction, committed itself, that the scheme would pay, and, therefore, must assume the loss. And in connexion with this Grand Trunk, I cannot pass over a monstrous piece of tyranny. One of the duties of the Government is to control the Legislature. The Parliament has no written constitution to control its powers; it may pass an Act of Confiscation, with the impunity of a despot. Last year, an Act was passed, enabling the Grand Trunk to carry its railway through any portion of this city--and it was passed, not with the assent merely, but by the whole force of the Government in this House. What think you, Sir, the Bill recited? Why, that the City of Toronto, in regard to giving land for the railway on the proposed Esplanade, had broken its contract with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and, therefore, it enacted the railway should be made along any street of this very city. But, it was said, it never was intended to carry it out. Was the tyranny the less, that the city was coerced to do what she considered was for her disadvantage? If a government had done this, whose principles were not conservative, or whose leaders were not considered statesmen, the wonder would have been less; but to have been done by all that remains, not only of the unbending Tory, but of the unflinching Conservative party, is matter of great surprise. How are the mighty fallen! I have spoken of some of the proofs which the Government gives us of our civilization, but it has omitted to tell us that we carry about with a perambulatory Government, the badge of semi-barbarism--and to tell us we have a nomad race of executive and government officers, with not even tents to dwell in. Can anything show more clearly how weak and contemptible that Government must be, which has not vitality enough to declare that the Government shall be stationary somewhere? We are constantly on the move, with no assurance that we shall ever rest; and, to crown all, this last move will cost us half a million of dollars! It is always to be regretted, when statesmen are so unfortunate as to announce principle when out of office, which they do not carry out when they get into office. Honorable gentlemen will remember that, in the year 1850, a Committee was appointed to enquire into the income and expenditure of the Province, and to report the matters submitted. The hon. Inspector-General has not forgotten that he was a member of that Committee, and on the 20th June, seconded by Mr. J.H. Cameron, proposed that it be resolved that the salary of the members of the Administration be the same in amount with those of the puisne judges of the Province, and he afterwards voted that these salaries should be 900L per annum. On the same day he proposed "that in the opinion of this Committee the office of Solicitor General in either section of the Province may be advantageously dispensed with, without detriment to the public service," and he voted for the resolution.<sup>193</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER called the member to order, and pointed out that the subject on which the member was about to enter was irrelevant to the question before the House.<sup>194</sup>

MR. WILSON, by the courtesy of the House, was allowed to proceed, and entered at length into the question of retrenchment.<sup>195</sup> Then on the 3rd July Mr. Cayley proposed the following in lieu of the 1st, 3[r]d and 4th paragraphs of the report. "Your Committee, impressed with the conviction that a thorough and searching system of retrenchment was alike demanded by the exigencies of the Province and the wishes of the people, have deemed it to be their duty to commence their labors by a careful review of the several duties assigned to the chief functionaries of the State, their

position and emoluments." On the same day he proposed that the salary of the Speaker should be three times the amount of indemnity allowed to members. Then he proposed, as part of the report, "that the Speaker of this House shall have 500L per annum, and the Speaker of the other House should be a member of the Government and head of a department, without any salary as Speaker." On the 4th July he also proposed "that one salaried Crown Law officer in the Executive is quite sufficient for all useful purposes of the State." On the 5th July he proposed, "that the Committee should submit that the salaries of the members of the Government be fixed at 800L per annum." And on the 12th July he proposed, "that the suggestions of the Hon. J.H. Cameron be in part adopted, that there should be but one Cabinet Law-officer for the Province, whose duty should be to advise on all political questions affecting the Government. And that the Attorneys General should not be members of the Government; that their duties should be to advise the Government on all legal questions submitted to them, and to attend to the legal duties of the Provinces respectively." Now comparing these resolutions, embodying the sentiments of the Inspector General, with the Act of last Session, cap. 89, we find that all Her Majesty's ministers are awarded 1250L per annum, while to each of the pui[s]ne judges 1000L a year is given. What, Sir, has changed the relative positions of these functionaries, in the opinion of Mr. Inspector General? Is it the change of times? Does this change affect the one as well as the other? No Sir, but the Inspector General was out of office then, and had no objection to embarrass the then Government with propositions which he cannot himself carry out. We are justly proud of our Judges in Upper Canada. At a time when few men in the Province possessed 1000L a-year, that salary was given to them, that in point of emolument, they should at least be on a par with the highest in the Province; but times have changed in two ways affecting them. The expense of living has increased seventy-five per cent., and the number of persons having incomes far exceeding theirs has increased ten fold. Not speaking of incomes which we know are large, arising from trades and professions, the salaried incomes of bank officers and railway officers exceeds (sic) theirs, and I say, sir, that it is misjudged economy, to overlook those who, from their very position, are prohibited from increasing their emoluments, or even speaking for themselves. Why was it, sir, that the Circuit Judges of Lower Canada, who rank, I suppose, with our County Judges, get 650L by that Act, while the County Court Judges, by the Upper Canada Act, have only 500L? And why, sir, did the Ministry take such good care of themselves, and so little of others? They had the power, and they used it. But, sir, there is a law on our Statute Book, the 12th Vic. Chap. 58, which some hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches may not just at this moment call to remembrance. In evil times, bad laws have sometimes been passed, but then better times came. The champions of right took care to expunge them from the Records of Parliament. I see, sir, that the learned and Gallant Knight does not yet recognize the Act to which I refer. Will he, and those gentlemen near him remember it, when I call it by the name they gave it, "the Bill to pay Rebels"? Well sir, they do remember it. That Bill was a good one, or it was what they represented it to be, the worst and vilest which ever disgraced a Legislature, or made worse than contemptible the Governor who assented to it. I am willing for their sake and for the sake of the argument to call it what they did, and to call him for the moment who assented to it what they did, and what follows? That if the honorable and gallant Knight, being now the leader of the Government, does not cause it to be repealed, he allows it to stand as a continuing rebuke to his conduct on the occasion of the passing of that Bill in all time to come. And sir, he does more, he emphatically tells this country that they who for the sake of occupying position, set the Province in a blaze, that her Majesty's representative might be recalled, were glad to approach that very same representative to take office from his hands,

and to present him with an address approving of his administration, and to bid him affectionately adieu on his leaving the Province.<sup>196</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY in reply to remarks which had fallen from the member for London would remind the hon. gentleman of his own tergiversation when he came down to the House and found the Conservatives out, and his subsequent turn when he found a further change had taken place.<sup>197</sup>

MR. FERRES said he was unwilling that the House should separate until he had offered some remarks upon what had fallen from the hon. members in the course of the debate, and he would also beg to observe that whatever difference of opinions may arise upon the debate, he trusted that the future of their labors would be marked with harmony.<sup>198</sup> There seemed to be a disposition manifested to find fault with the address in some way, but there was a lack of understanding as to the grounds upon which objections were to be taken: first, they had the resolution in relation to schools in the Eastern province. We were told by the gentleman from Montreal, (Mr. Dorion,) that the state of education in Lower Canada was in a very bad state. If he had stated that common school education was in a backward condition there, he would have agreed with him, but the hon. gentleman should have also accompanied his statement with the declaration of the fact, that the cause of academical and collegiate education, was progressing there under the most favourable auspices. He had no desire to exaggerate in the least, but he believed, that the cause of higher education in Lower Canada, was in as flourishing a condition as in Upper Canada.<sup>199</sup> He was glad that the subject of a Normal school had been urged upon the government, and to hear the Provincial Secretary declare that the Government were about to act in the matter.<sup>200</sup> He could not imagine that there was any gentleman in the House who would refuse to give ample support to Normal Schools. The circumstances of Lower Canada were somewhat peculiar, and with respect to the establishment of a model school there, it would be necessary perhaps to organize two departments, one for the English and one for the French, so that teachers who were sent out from that establishment might go into the country and teach the youth of both nations in their own language. He would candidly join with every man in impressing upon the Government the absolute necessity there was of establishing a model school and putting it into operation at as early a day as possible. Fault had been found because of the omissions in the address from the throne relating to the trade and commerce of the Province, but an address of this character did not necessarily go into a history of the claims connected with the different departments of the government. It was not, therefore, necessary to mention more than in general terms the depression existing in trade.--If gentlemen were not satisfied with such a declaration, why had they not specified the articles of trade which were in a depressed condition. He understood that the gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Young) had alluded to a falling off of trade of that city, although he was not present when he made the declaration. He could recollect very well when the trade of Montreal was in a highly flourishing condition, and he did not know that it was now in a very depressed state<sup>201</sup>, though it had not increased as it ought to have done<sup>202</sup>. He could recollect that week after week it was stated that the merchants of Montreal did not need any protection to their trade, in order to meet the wants of the province. They wished all differential duties to be done away with. He should be glad, for his part, to see the whole trade of the British Provinces following the channel of the St. Lawrence. If there was a cheaper mode of communicating with foreign countries than by that river, he did not know that any portion of the British Provinces should be benefitted to the injury of another, and that Lower Canada should be benefitted to the injury of Upper Canada, by forcing trade into an unnatural channel. In respect to the question of

Internal Improvements he thought that the Government had done all that could be reasonably expected of them in the present depressed state of the finances.<sup>203</sup> He hoped the Government would, however, lose no time in finding out what could be done. They had done this with respect both to the Caughnawaga canal and the deepening of the rapids of the St. Lawrence<sup>204</sup>, by ordering a survey to be promptly made.<sup>205</sup> One honorable gentleman had found fault with the address because there was no allusion to a permanent Seat of Government. In regard to that matter he considered that the present system was a disgraceful one to the country, that it had actually depreciated Canada in the eyes of foreign countries, and that it had been attended with a wicked and useless waste of the public money. But he would ask whether it was desirable, in view of the great difference of opinion upon this subject, to have alluded to it in an address from the throne. At the same time, he believed the sooner this House came to a decision on the subject, the better it would be for the country. The expense of the removal, doubtless, would amount to 100,000L. He had no doubt that the expenses of previous removals had exceeded 150,000L. With respect to the trade of Montreal, it had been increasing steadily, although it was not equal to what it would have been if circumstances had remained as they were. He desired to know who were the most anxious that the revenue should be further reduced at the last Session of the Parliament. The Inspector General went a little further than he should have done, in reducing the tariff, but he did not go near as far as some of the honorable gentlemen who had made most bitter remarks upon the Inspector General.<sup>206</sup>

MR. YOUNG offered some further remarks in explanation of what had subsequently fallen from speakers, who had misunderstood his remarks, as he had not argued that any special favor should be granted to Montreal, but that it was the duty of the Government to foster the trade of the Province on British waters<sup>207</sup>. The people of Montreal wished no protection, but only fair play. They thought the present tariff operated unfairly against them.<sup>208</sup> If the proper improvements were made, such were the bounties which nature had bestowed upon the Provincial inland waters that they may easily be made available, for not only the vast trade of the West to the ocean, but a large portion of that trade to the Eastern States.<sup>209</sup>

MR. MURNEY ... [said] a few words<sup>210</sup>. [He] moved an adjournment of the debate, which was not agreed to.<sup>211</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB proposed that the House should vote upon the one amendment under consideration, and then adjourn the House upon the further portions of the address.<sup>212</sup>

The question was then taken on Mr. Dorion's amendment, and it was negatived.<sup>213</sup>

(27)

*Mr. Murney moved, seconded by Mr. Foley, and the Question being put, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow; the House divided:--And it passed in the Negative.*

*And the Question being put, That the words "But this House would be wanting in its duty, if it failed to express its deep regret, at learning that His Excellency has not been advised to recommend to the consideration of this House, any measures relating to the important subject of General Education, especially in the Eastern Section of the Province; nor to certain important branches of the trade and commerce of the Province which are now in a very depressed state; nor to the subject of those*

(28)

internal improvements which are absolutely requisite to give additional facilities for the transit of the produce of the West to the Ocean. And this House feels bound to declare that the absence of all reference to those subjects will be considered by the People of this Province as a neglect by His Excellency's advisers of what they consider measures of paramount importance," be added at the end of the second paragraph; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

## YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Fergusson, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Marchildon, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, Wright, and Young.--(37.)

## NAYS.

Messieurs Bell, Bellingham, Biggar, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Niles, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Roblin, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(63.)

So it passed in the Negative.<sup>214</sup>

And the second paragraph being again read;

And a Debate arising thereupon;<sup>215</sup>

On motion of Mr. Murney, seconded by Mr. Foley,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.

Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,

The House adjourned.<sup>216</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SALARY OF CHIEF JUDGE EDWARD BOWEN.]

MR. LORANGER [donne avis que] vendredi prochain [il proposera un] comité général pour prendre en considération la convenance de présenter à son excellence le gouverneur-général une humble adresse, lui exposant:

Que vu les long[s] services de l'honorable Edward Bowen, juge en chef de la cour supérieure du Bas-Canada, tant comme juge en chef de cette cour que comme juge puisné des premiers tribunaux civils et criminels du pays,—services qui embrassent une période de quarante-quatre années révolues.

Vu que l'acte 12 Victoria, chap. 37, sous l'autorité duquel le dit honorable Edward Bowen a été nommé juge en chef de la dite cour supérieure, ne fixe aucun salaire attaché à cette situation, et que ce fut par un ordre en conseil en date du 24 décembre 1849 que son salaire fut fixé à 1000L par année, tant que l'honorable juge Rolland demeurerait en charge comme juge puisné de la cour du banc de la reine, ce salaire devant être élevé à 1250L à la mort ou sur la résignation de ce dernier.

Vu l'acte 9 Vic., chap. 114, qui accorde une liste civile à sa majesté par lequel le salaire de juge en chef de Montréal ou de Québec, suivant le cas, est fixé à 1200L par les nominations postérieures à cet acte.

Vu l'acte 14 et 15 Vic., chap. 173, qui décrète: que le salaire de tout juge en chef de la cour du banc de la reine ou de la cour supérieure, nommé ou à être nommé depuis le 10 août 1850, n'excèdera pas la somme de 900L, mais que les juges en chef des dites cours seront les fonctionnaires dont les salaires seront payables en vertu du dit acte 9 Vic., chap. 114, fixant comme susdit le salaire de juge en chef de Québec et Montréal à 1200L, et leur assimilant le juge en chef de la cour supérieure sous le rapport du salaire.

Vu que le dit honorable juge Bowen a été nommé juge en chef de la cour supérieure, antérieurement au 10 août 1850, savoir le 24 décembre 1849, qu'il ne peut être affecté par le dit acte 14 et 15 Vic., chap. 173 qui ne fixe à 900L que le salaire du juge en chef nommé depuis le 10 août 1850, et que le salaire accordé par le dit acte 14 et 15 Vic., chap. 173, au juge en chef de la cour supérieure, a été de 1200L, montant accordé par l'acte 9 Vic., chap. 114, aux juges en chef de Québec et de Montréal.

Vu cependant, que le dit juge en chef Bowen n'a reçu depuis sa nomination jusqu'au jour de la résignation de l'honorable juge Rolland qu'un salaire de 1000L, celui fixé par l'ordre en conseil du 24 décembre 1849, et qu'il est expédient de réparer cette émission.

Et priant son excellence de vouloir bien ordonner que la différence entre la somme de 1000L, c'est-à-dire la somme de 200L annuellement comme arrérages depuis la nomination du dit honorable juge Rolland sera payée au dit honorable juge en chef Bowen.<sup>217</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.]

MR. C. DAOUST [donne avis que] vendredi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence le gouverneur général pour copie d'aucun rapport qui aurais (sic) pu être fait par Sydney Bellingham, écuyer, membre pour le comté d'Argenteuil, depuis la dernière session de parlement, relativement aux dommages causés aux terres qui bordent les deux côtés du lac St. François, par la chaussée construite à la tête du canal de Beauharnois, ainsi qu'un état des dépenses encourues et des émoluments payés au dit Sydney Bellingham, écuyer, pour cet objet.<sup>218</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 20 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. GLOBE, 21 February 1856. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856, provides the following commentary: "Une requête de la part de certains habitants du village l'Avenir, présentée par M. J.B.E. Dorion, a créé beaucoup de sensation à Toronto. Cette requête demande que la chambre prenne les moyens de faire rappeler sir Edmund Head, le gouverneur actuel, pour son incompétence à gouverner le pays, parce qu'au lieu d'essayer à concilier les différentes populations qui l'habitent, il paraît travailler à créer des haines et des dissensions (sic) qui ne peuvent qu'avoir des conséquences funestes."
2. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
3. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
4. IBID.
5. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
6. IBID.
7. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
8. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
9. IBID.
10. IBID.
11. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
12. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
13. IBID.
14. IBID.
15. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
16. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
17. IBID.
18. IBID.
19. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
20. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 26 February 1856, in its commentary, mentions the following: "M. Evanturel, the new member for the County of Quebec is on his feet moving the reply to the speech from the throne.... The House is pretty full, only 18 or 17 members being absent."
21. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
22. LE PAYS, 23 February 1856.
23. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856.
24. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
25. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
26. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
27. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
28. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
29. This paragraph has been termed the "first paragraph" of the motion by certain newspapers, notably GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
30. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
31. IBID.
32. IBID.
33. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
34. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
35. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
36. IBID.
37. IBID.
38. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
39. IBID.
40. IBID.

41. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
42. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
43. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
44. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
45. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
46. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
47. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
48. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
49. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
50. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
51. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
52. IBID.
53. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
54. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
55. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
56. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
57. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
58. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
59. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
60. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
61. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
62. IBID.
63. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
64. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
65. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
66. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
67. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
68. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
69. IBID.
70. IBID.
71. IBID.
72. IBID.
73. IBID.
74. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
75. IBID.
76. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
78. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
79. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
80. IBID.
81. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
82. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
83. IBID.
84. IBID.
85. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
86. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
87. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
88. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
89. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
90. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
91. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
92. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
93. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.

94. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
95. IBID.
96. IBID.
97. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
98. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
99. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
100. IBID.
101. IBID.
102. IBID.
103. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
104. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
105. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
106. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
107. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
108. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
109. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
110. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
111. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
112. QUEBEC GAZETTE, 26 February 1856.
113. GLOBE, 21 February 1856. A commentary from GLOBE, 21 February 1856, reports Mr. Cartier "held the floor for nearly three hours.... It was amusing to observe the anxiety of his colleagues to get the Provincial Secretary back into his seat--hints, whispers, and even slips of paper were evidently all lost on the orator, who kept screaming on, despite everything."
114. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
115. IBID.
116. IBID.
117. IBID.
118. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
119. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
120. IBID.
121. IBID.
122. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
123. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
124. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
125. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
126. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
127. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
128. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
129. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
130. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
131. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
132. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
133. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
134. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
135. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856, reports similar information; however, GLOBE, 21 February 1856, reports a different interpretation of the figures here stated. It reads as follows: "The trade from the west in 1835 was \$3,000,000. Ten years later, 1845, it amounted [to] \$8,000,000. The last year shows that it has increased to the enormous amount of \$24,000,000."
136. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
137. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.

138. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
139. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
140. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
141. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
142. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
143. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
144. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
145. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
146. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
147. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
148. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
149. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
150. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
151. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
152. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
153. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
154. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
155. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
156. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
157. IBID.
158. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
159. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
160. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
161. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
162. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
163. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
164. LA MINERVE, 27 February 1856. These last remarks are reported differently in GLOBE, 21 February 1856, as follows: "Mr. Thibaudeau ... said that the speech of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion) was worthy of a place in the columns of the Globe, that great enemy of French Canadian institutions, and was an evidence of his close alliance with the hon. member for Lambton."
165. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
166. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
167. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
168. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
169. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
170. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
171. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
172. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
173. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
174. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
175. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
176. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
177. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
178. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
179. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
180. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
181. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
182. IBID.
183. IBID.
184. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
185. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
186. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.

187. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856, differs from this newspaper and reports the following statement: "Stratford exceeded London, & Niagara, St. Catherines".
188. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
189. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
190. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
191. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
192. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856.
193. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
194. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
195. IBID.
196. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
197. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
198. IBID.
199. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
200. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
201. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
202. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
203. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
204. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
205. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
206. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
207. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
208. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
209. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
210. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856. The commentary from GLOBE, 21 February 1856, stipulates "Mr. Murney attacked the Government".
211. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
212. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
213. GLOBE, 21 February 1856.
214. The following comment on the vote was reported in LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856: "Si forte qu'ait été la majorité sur ce vote--63 à 37--elle l'aurait été bien davantage si la chambre eut été au complet. Parmi les absents se trouvaient 26 amis du ministère, et 3 partisans seulement de l'opposition. La majorité eût donc été de 89 contre 40, c'est-à-dire de plus du double de la majorité." GLOBE, 21 February 1856, also stipulates in its commentary that "twenty-one Upper Canadians voted with the Opposition, against 31 with the Ministry."
215. The newspapers report no further debate.
216. GLOBE, 21 February 1856, and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 21 February 1856, report "the House then adjourned at half-past 12 o'clock."
217. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
218. IBID.

THURSDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 1856.

After MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER had taken the chair<sup>1</sup>,

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE in reply to a question from an hon. member stated, in reference to a point of privilege of the House in connection with the Post Office, that any letters mailed up to 9 p.m. at the General Post Office would be mailed that night. He had no control over the Post Office and its arrangements in this House, that being under the control of the Hon. Speaker. During the sittings of the House an additional number of hands were employed in the Post Office and any arrangement which the Hon. Speaker may make for the delivery of the correspondence of the members of the House would be promptly met by the Post Office Department.<sup>2</sup>

(29)

*THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--*

*By Mr. Stevenson,--The Petition of the Honorable Simeon Washburn, of the Town of Picton, County of Prince Edward.*

*By Mr. Casault,--The Petition of Jean Langevin, of the City of Quebec.*

*By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of Louis Beaudouin and others, of the Parish of St. Paul, County of Joliette.*

*By Mr. Joseph Curran Morrison,--Two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland.*

*By Mr. Evanturel,--The Petition of H.J. Noad, President of the Quebec Board of Trade, and others, of the City of Quebec; the Petition of the Directors of the North Shore Railway Company; the Petition of Michael Scott, President, and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of the Village of Cap Rouge; and the Petition of the Reverend E. Payment, and others, of the Parishes of Beauport and Charlesbourg, County of Quebec.*

*By Mr. Bellingham,--The Petition of the Trustees of the Academy of St. André d'Argenteuil.*

*By Mr. Chapais,--The Petition of the Reverend L.A. Bourret, Curé of Ste. Anne, and others, of the Counties of L'Islet and Kamouraska.*

*By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--Two Petitions of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland.*

*By Mr. Southwick,--The Petition of the Justices of the Peace for the County of Elgin, in Quarter Sessions assembled.*

*By Mr. Yeilding,--The Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of the City of Ottawa.*

*By the Honorable Mr. Robinson,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of West Gwillimbury, County of Simcoe.*

*Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--*

*Of the Montreal Protestant Orphan Asylum; praying for aid.*

*Of the Managers of the Protestant Industrial House of Refuge of Montreal; praying for aid.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of Saltfleet, County of Wentworth; praying that any application from John Robert Martin to vest in him the original Road allowance between the third and fourth Concessions of the Township of Saltfleet, County of Wentworth, may not be granted.*

*Of John Wade, of the Township of Hamilton, and Benjamin Seymour, of the Town of Port Hope; praying for the passing of an Act to vest in them the original Road*

allowance between lots numbers thirty-four and thirty-five, in the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland.

Of Gédeon Brien dit Desrochers and others, of the Townships of Kilkenny and Wexford, County of Montcalm; praying for aid to open a Road.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Peterborough and Victoria; praying that the County Councils may be authorized to delegate their control over County Roads to Township Councils.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Peterborough and Victoria; praying that a change may be made in the period for taking the Census in Upper Canada.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Peterborough and Victoria; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of the Reverend James Reid, D.D., and others, of the Parish of St. Armand East, County of Missisquoi; praying aid for the erection of an Academy in the Village of Freleighsburgh.

(30)

Of the Trustees of Dissident Schools of the Scholastic Municipality of the Borough of Sorel, County of Richelieu; praying aid for a Model School in the said Borough.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Grey; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Grey; praying for certain amendments to the Municipal Act of Upper Canada.

Of A. McNabb and others, Reeves of the County of Bruce; and of the Reeves and Deputy Reeves of the Townships in the County of Bruce; praying for the passing of an Act setting apart the County of Bruce from the County of Huron.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Huron and Bruce; praying for the passing of an Act ratifying and confirming the deed of conveyance made by the Municipal Council of the Town of Goderich of the land upon which the Court House is erected.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Huron and Bruce; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company to lease their Road; and also, for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.

Mr. Fergusson, from the Select Committee appointed to try and determine the matter of the Petition complaining of an undue Election and Return for the City of Quebec, informed the House that the Committee had determined,

That the Sitting Members for the City of Quebec were duly elected at the last Election for that City.

That neither the Petition of George Okill Stuart, George H. Simard and Hypolite Dubord, Esquires, nor the defence of the sitting Members, were frivolous or vexatious.

The Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, from the Select Committee appointed to prepare and report Lists of Members, to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House, reported, That they had prepared Lists of Members accordingly; and the same were read, as follow:--

1. On Privileges and Elections.--The Honorable Mr. Chabot, Mr. Solicitor General Ross, the Honorable Mr. Spence, Mr. Alleyn, Mr. Cryslér, Mr. Burton, Mr. Laberge, Mr. Egan, Mr. Dufresne, Mr. Frazer, Mr. McCann, Mr. Polette, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Blanchet, and Mr. Wilson.

2. On Expiring Laws.--The Honorable Mr. Rolph, Mr. Scatcherd, Mr. Labelle, Mr. Larwill, Mr. Aikins, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Octave C. Fortier, Mr. Yeilding, Mr. Laporte, Mr. O'Farrell, Mr. LeBoutillier, Mr. Meagher, Mr. Dostaler, Mr. Bourassa, Mr. Guévremont, and Mr. Marchildon.

3. On Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines.--The Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald, the Honorable Mr. Robinson, Mr. Crawford, the Honorable Mr. Cartier, the Honorable Mr. Cauchon, Mr. Foley, Mr. Mongenais, Mr. Papin, Mr. Rankin, Mr. Joseph C. Morrison, Mr. Bureau, Mr. Bellingham, Mr. James Smith, the Honorable Mr. John S. Macdonald, the Honorable Mr. Merritt, and Mr. Clarke.

4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills.--The Honorable Mr. Cameron, Mr. Polette, Mr. Felton, Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, Mr. Powell, Mr. Prévost, Mr. Loranger, Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Angus Morrison, Mr. Fergusson, Mr. Gill, Mr. Charles Daoust, Mr. Price, and Mr. Wright.

5. On Standing Orders.--Mr. Brown, Mr. Turcotte, Mr. Sidney Smith, Mr. James Ross, Mr. Murney, Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion, Mr. Casault, Mr. Bowes, Mr. Poulin, Mr. Christie, Mr. Chapais, Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Jean Baptiste Daoust, Mr. Lumsden, and Mr. Conger.

(31)

6. On Printing.--Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Terrill, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ferres, Mr. Fournier, the Honorable Mr. Young, Mr. Flint, Mr. Joseph C. Morrison, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Bell, Mr. Daly, Mr. Dionne, Mr. Delong, Mr. Munro, and Mr. Matheson.

7. On Contingencies.--Mr. Roblin, Mr. Galt, Mr. Niles, Mr. Brown, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Gould, Mr. Valois, Mr. Jobin, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Chisholm, Mr. Church, Mr. Thomas Fortier, Mr. Desaulniers, Mr. Darche, Mr. Macbeth, Mr. Roderick McDonald, Mr. Alanson Cooke, Mr. Thibaudeau, and Mr. Jean Baptiste Daoust.

8. On Public Accounts.--Mr. Holton, Mr. Patrick, the Honorable Mr. Young, Mr. Evanturel, Mr. Gamble, the Honorable Mr. Merritt, Mr. Chapais, Mr. DeWitt, Mr. Masson, Mr. Ferrie, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Mattice, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Somerville, Mr. Southwick, and Mr. Whitney.

Resolved, That this House doth concur with the Committee in the said Report.

Ordered, That the Petition of Joseph Allard and others, residing along the line of the Montreal and Kingston Railway, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB having moved the orders of the Day, with a view to resuming the Debate on the Address<sup>3</sup>,

MR. POWELL asked permission to proceed in the first place with a notice of motion relating to the management of the Crown Land Department, on which subject Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Glengary) had also given a notice. He desired to move an address to His Excellency for copies of all departmental orders by which the public are excluded from admission to the offices of the Crown Land Department. He had business to transact with that Department, and he did not wish to have anything to do with it, so long as the present system was continued, unless it was sustained by the House.<sup>4</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB wished the hon. member to allow the House to go on with the reply to the Speech, which he hoped might be got through with that night. A delay of a day to the hon. member could not be a matter of much consequence.<sup>5</sup>

MR. POWELL said that his constituents had placed in his hands certain matters of business connected with the Crown Land Department and under the present regulations he found great difficulty in transacting business there. He accordingly desired the matter to be disposed of at once.<sup>6</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD, (Glengary,) hoped that the Government would yield to the request of his hon. friend from Carleton, because the charges in the manner in which the Crown Land business was managed, were an outrage upon the feelings of the people of Upper Canada, and should be disposed of one way or another immediately.<sup>7</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said the matter must be postponed till the debate on the Address closed. But when the subject alluded to, was brought before the House, he trusted, that he would be able to give such explanations as would satisfy hon. members.<sup>8</sup>

MR. ROBINSON, without approving of these new arrangements in the Crown Lands Office, thought very little could be gained by going into the question now.<sup>9</sup>

[MR. POWELL] ... finding that the Premier was desirous to proceed with the debate on the Address consented to postpone his motion on the subject.<sup>10</sup>

(31)

*And the Order of the day being read, for resuming the adjourned Debate upon the second paragraph of the question which was yesterday proposed, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:*

*To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season, in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:*

*That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of the Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:*

*That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress that has been made:*

*That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective:*

*That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:*

*That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of*

(32)

*civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:*

*That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:*

*That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since their last meeting nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:*

*That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts, by the adoption of practical amendments:*

*That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours, in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:*

*That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:*

*That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal, and instructing him in vice:*

*That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:*

*That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing the Sedentary Militia:*

*That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure*

a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and

(33)

the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs' Duties which were made by Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic we have, however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:

That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:

That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honourable peace, Canada will rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event;

The House resumed the said adjourned Debate.

MR. J.S. MACDONALD, (Glengary,) ... said, that the House were now asked by the mover and seconder of the Address, to give a general vote of confidence in the administration, in reference to their management of public affairs during their incumbency. Their position was very different now, from that which they occupied, when they first took possession of the Treasury Benches. On assuming office, on the resignation of the late administration, they did not come forward with any definite policy of their own<sup>11</sup>; they came down after having made an agreement with their opponents, adopting as their platform the views of the late Administration. The speaker would recollect that the Administration which preceded them lost the confidence of the country on many questions which had agitated the country for many years. When the dissolution took place and the members went to the country, the leading members of the Conservative party went to their constituents as opposed to the very measures which the Reform party were most anxious to carry out. When

Parliament was called together, were not the conservative party arrayed against the reform party of that time. Were they not opposed to the settlement of the Reserve question, and it was not till they saw a chance of forming a combination with the reform administration, that they ceased their Opposition. They had then to go to the country and obtain the approbation of their constituents to the combination which they had formed. When they then took their places on the Treasury benches, they were asked again and again to define their policy, and they declared that the principles of the Government that had just left office were to be carried out.<sup>12</sup> But he must confess that he was taken by surprise at so large a portion of the Reform party being led to believe that those who had during their whole political lives been opponents of those great measures desired by Reformers, should so easily turn round and carry them out in conformity with the wishes of the great body of the people of Upper Canada. When they returned from their constituents they began to legislate, but at what time did the House get those great measures placed before them. The Administration delayed day after day bringing them forward, but at last they passed their measures, and now they called upon the House to express satisfaction with them. He for one was not prepared to say that the result of the present Administration getting into power had been the carrying out of those great questions in the manner that Reformers had looked for. He maintained on the contrary, that they had violated their pledges and broken their promises. (Hear, hear.) Before the breaking up of the late Administration, in the Speech from the Throne, Lord Elgin stated that some organic change in the constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering that body elective, was absolutely necessary, and strongly recommended Parliament to legislate accordingly. He also recommended measures for the settlement of the Clergy Reserve and Seigniorial Tenure questions, in conformity with the wishes of the people. He would ask the House whether the Administration had legislated on those two questions in such a manner as met the wishes of the people? (Hear, hear.) Would it be said that the policy of the late Administration had been carried out? Was the commutation scheme ever contemplated by the late Administration (sic)? He regretted that many Reform members, misled by the hope that the Clergy Reserve question would be fairly settled according to the wishes of the Reform party, had so far committed themselves to the mode in which the Administration had settled it, that they could now scarcely do otherwise than support the Administration in this Address. But if they went out of doors, and consulted the general feeling, he could tell them that their settlement of the Clergy Reserve question had given very little satisfaction to the public. (Hear, hear.) Then, as regarded the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, he asked whether that settlement had been satisfactory to the country? He considered that very sufficient evidence existed to the contrary, in the resolutions intended to be submitted on that subject. With regard to making the Legislative Council elective, Lord Elgin very strongly recommended that measure to the consideration of the House, in the speech from the throne. But how did the present Administration deal with the question? Hon. members could not have avoided observing the singularly faint and vague manner in which that subject was mentioned in the speech from the throne by his Excellency, Sir Edmund Head. Instead of saying that an organic change was necessary, his Excellency was now advised to say simply that the subject of a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council would be again brought before the House. Was that equivalent to the strong language used in 1854? Why this apathy? Why should the Administration use this qualified language, and instruct their organs at this moment to say that they cannot understand why the Administration should be so stupid as to bring forward the question of the Legislative Council? He contended that there was far and near a general disapprobation of the manner in which the proceedings of the Legislative Council were carried on, and the Elective principle had been declared

more than once in speeches from the throne to be necessary, in order to give the body a respectable standing, and to enable the country to repose confidence in them. Why then was the Administration not grappling in earnest with the question? Last session they brought it in at the eleventh hour. On all the questions on which the Administration felt keenly, and which they desired to carry, they went heart and soul into them. But the Legislative Council Bill was differently dealt with. It was passed at the eleventh hour, and being sent to the upper House was then bucked. And now. If they were really in earnest, why did his Excellency use so general language, and why did they not silence their organs, and prevent them from speaking in opposition to the measure? (Hear, hear.) Then what had taken place in reference to the Franchise? There had been no legislation upon it with the exception of one amendment made last session by the Attorney General. Was that carrying out the policy of the late Administration as they avowed their intention of doing? Then with regard to education, he would ask whether the legislation on the school question had given satisfaction to the country? Last year, at the instigation of certain parties who desired to have Separate Schools, they brought in a measure, but that measure was so curtailed that it gave satisfaction neither to Catholics on the one side nor to<sup>13</sup> Protestants<sup>14</sup> on the other. Was that a kind of legislation which should secure for the Administration the confidence either of the country or the House? (Hear, hear.) Then what was the policy they now enunciated? In the first place, there was a recommendation in vague terms in reference to a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council. On that point he had already spoken. Then there was to be a Police Bill. This formed a portion of the scheme of which the Militia Bill was another part, and as they found that a very difficult task to carry through, they dropped the Police Bill altogether. But now they came down and asked powers to establish a Provincial Police. What evidence was there of the necessity of this? What petitions had come in for it? What manifestations of public opinion had there been for a scheme which would necessarily be dangerous to the liberty and freedom of the people of this country? Where was the Township Council or County Council that had asked for it? (Hear, hear.) Was it said that it was necessary to put down riots? To say so was an insult to the people of this country, and a stigma on their character. He could not doubt for a moment that the creation of patronage was the real reason for establishing this idle Police Force. (Hear, hear.) For idle it must be in a country like Canada. During the whole operations of the Grand Trunk, west of Kingston, bringing together large bodies of labourers, there had not been a single disturbance; and there had been equally little necessity in the Ottawa District to put down riots. They should be very careful about giving the Government powers to establish a Rural Police.<sup>15</sup> The rural constituenc[i]es did not need it; ministers who, with one exception, came from cities and towns, desired it for the benefit of their constituencies. There was a necessity for a constabulary in Ireland when the people had grown up imbued with religious feuds. He could understand that it was necessary there to force a state church upon the people opposed by the opinions of the majority of them, and to suppress riots against absentee landlords,<sup>16</sup> but in Canada it was very different. And yet they were called upon to settle upon themselves a burden of 50,000L or 60,000L a year, for the purpose of giving agents, emissaries, and spies to the Government, he would say any Government, for there would be to any Government a strong temptation to take advantage of the employment of those men, and the people would be the victims. And, if this Police scheme was carried, what a splendid patronage would it place in the hands of the Government! There were to be Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners, 7 Superintendents, 12 Inspectors, 12 Sergeants, 350 Constables, and 150 Sub-Constables. The snug Commissioner's berth at 750L per annum, with perquisites, would be a very nice thing in the hands of the Government. So with the other offices--they would dispose

of them for their own advantage in the same way as they had done the higher offices connected with the militia. Was this a sufficiently desirable object, that to secure its accomplishment they would saddle the people of Canada with a charge of 50,000L a year? (Hear, hear.) And it would not stop there. In a country like Canada, where steady industrious men could soon obtain for themselves a competence, could it be expected that efficient constables and sub-constables could be got at 3s 6d and 3s a day? He had no doubt the Government would push this Police Bill, as there was so much patronage connected with it; but he must say that he regarded it as an attempt to inflict one of the greatest curses that could be fastened upon the country. (Cries of hear, hear.)<sup>17</sup> He then referred to the statement in the speech in reference to legal reform, and considered that some member of the administration or the gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address, should have given them some idea of what was meant by this legal reform. Did they contemplate some change in the Court of Chancery, by which the Judges of that Court should be made to go on circuit, and thus bring the benefit of such a Court within the reach of all? If so, why not state it?<sup>18</sup> Instead of all the business being centralized in Toronto the judges should take circuits through the country, as the judges of other courts did.<sup>19</sup> Again, the Address did not encourage the hope that the Government would take the responsibility of introducing a measure for the settlement of the vexed question of Ecclesiastical Incorporations. He would lend his voice and aid to secure a measure that would remove from the halls of legislation those questions that were productive of unpleasant feelings and bickerings, which occupied so much the time of the country. He would avail himself of any opportunity that would enable him to carry out his views in regard to so desirable a reform. The evidence was conclusive that the Government were not willing to grapple with that question, but preferred leaving it to some independent member of the House, so that if it failed, the responsibility would not rest with them. If the house had been told what the administration were intending to do with that question, it would have been a satisfactory announcement to them and the country.<sup>20</sup> In regard to the state of the jails, as mentioned in the Speech, he was satisfied that gentlemen on his side of the House would afford all the assistance in their power to put the jails of the country in a better condition than they are at present.<sup>21</sup> The cause of education had been commented upon by those who had preceded him so ably in this debate, that he did not deem it necessary to present his views upon that subject at any great length at present. Mr. McDonald, after briefly alluding to the clergy reserves question and the militia system, said, by way of conclusion, that he had another remark to make with reference to the conduct of the administration during the last session in carrying out a measure of reform demanded by the people, and that was the Maine Law. This house had declared that such a law was necessary, but the administration threw their whole force into the scale to defeat that measure when one of the ablest men upon their side interposed a technical objection to the measure, and in that way it was defeated. Was that a course calculated to carry out the views of the people of this country? Here was a great measure which had agitated the country from one end of the country to the other, and they threw cold water upon it. (Cries of hear, hear, and great laughter.)<sup>22</sup> Mr. MacDonald next dwelt at some length upon the rumoured disunions in the Cabinet<sup>23</sup>. There was a desire on the part of the Administration, which we were called upon to support, to break up the conservative party, and drive away one portion that it might fall into the hands of the Reformers. As a party the administration could not long sustain their position, because it was well known there was a distrust among them, and without a cordiality of feeling among themselves, they could not carry out their views.<sup>24</sup>

A voice.--How does the opposition exist?<sup>25</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD.--The opposition are watching the government. The administration must come down with principles, which shall command the confidence of the country, and the opposition must watch them. Gentlemen may tell him that the administration does command the confidence of the country, but he had seen no evidence of the fact<sup>26</sup>. He had confidence in and respect for some members of the administration individually, but had no confidence in their legislation, and was therefore not prepared to vote for the Address.<sup>27</sup> [He] concluded by admitting that in one thing, and one only, he must give the ministers credit, they had called Parliament together at the season declared by Parliament itself most convenient for the purpose.<sup>28</sup>

MR. S. SMITH in opening his speech said, that the gentleman from Glengary (Mr. McDonald) seemed to be distressed at the dissensions which he fancied to exist in the Cabinet. If the hon. member had the same anxiety in regard to the dissensions which existed among the opposition, he did not know what would become of him. (Cries of hear, hear.)<sup>29</sup> If the hon. gentleman had always been alike anxious for the Reform party to which the speaker belonged, it would have been better for those great measures of reform, for which they had ... struggled.<sup>30</sup> The hon. gentlemen (sic) has himself to blame for the divisions which exist among reformers. From his desire to be ... No. 1, he created so much dissension among them that he naturally went over to the opposition benches, instead of being on the treasury benches at which he looks across the House. There is a rumour abroad, and he supposed that as the hon. gentleman from Glengary took rumours for his authority, he had a perfect right to do the same; and according to these rumours the member for Glengary had receded from his post of honor in the reform ranks, had taken a step backwards, and instead of being now the leader, is in reality the ex-leader of the opposition, that he has given ... [way] to the member for Lambton.<sup>31</sup> The hon. gentleman from Glengarry would not be in his present position connected with his party had he been faithful to them. And in what position does he now find himself? Let him look around upon his company;--at a short distance we have the hon. member for Haldimand, who, no doubt, is ready for an onslaught upon all parties. But I would ask the hon. member for Glengarry to find sentiments of accord with the member from Haldimand, or from North York, as to Sectarian Schools. Will the hon. member for Lambton vote with him upon that question?<sup>32</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD ... [replied], that he did not support Separate Schools.<sup>33</sup>

[MR. S. SMITH continued:] Upon the subject of popular representation, there was no doubt, as to the views of the hon. gentleman from Lambton, (Mr. Brown) and he desired to know if the hon. gentleman from Glengary, would endorse them, and he might ask the same question with regard to other gentlemen on the opposition side of the House.--Upon the various questions of an elective Legislative Council, disunion of the provinces, elective governor, separate schools, was there accord and unanimity of opinion between the hon. gentleman from Lambton and the opponents of the administration? Was there not a great diversity of opinion among the members of the opposition upon these and other subjects?<sup>34</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Hear.<sup>35</sup>

MR. S. SMITH, the member for Lambton, cries (sic) "hear." The honorable gentleman<sup>36</sup> had always been successful in coercing his followers into a support of his views. He was always sitting quietly in his seat, looking on, pulling the wires over the<sup>37</sup> oi polloi who sits by him<sup>38</sup>--a mixture of clear grit, disunionists,

annexationists, but the member from Lambton would find greater difficulty in bringing his supporters into a support of his views, than did the gentleman from Glengary, whom he supplanted as leader of the opposition. Upon the subject of education, there seemed to be quite an understanding among the opposition that they could not express their opinion upon that subject, without clashing in their views with each other. The gentleman from Glengary stated that the settlement of the seigniorial question had not given satisfaction in Lower Canada. Upon what did the gentleman found his opinion? Was it upon the speech of the gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Dorion)? Would the gentleman say, in the face of the vote of last night, that the Government had not been sustained by the voice of Lower Canada, by an overwhelming majority?<sup>39</sup> I tell him again that the vote of last night has sustained the government, and I further tell him that the vote to-night will do so, and the vote every night will sustain them in the policy which they are prepared to carry out. And further, if it did not, he would be prepared to take the vote of the people upon that question<sup>40</sup>--

Hear, hear, from MR. BROWN<sup>41</sup>.

[MR. S. SMITH continued:] Gentlemen from the other side of the House might cry hear, hear, but they would hear something ere long which they may not like so well, and they had better take it easy.<sup>42</sup> The House had supported the policy of the ministers, and the people had confirmed it by the re-election of ministers, most of them without opposition; opposition had been made in some quarters, but the hon. Post-master General was returned in spite of the efforts of the member for Lambton, and the 39 opposition stars<sup>43</sup>. That honorable gentleman went to Wentworth to canvass against the Post Master General, he stumped the county thoroughly, and the result was the triumphant return of the Post Master General, and a verdict in favor of the Government. He went to the County of Peterborough, stumped it in opposition to the sitting member, used every effort which the control of the Globe newspaper put in his hands, and told the electors plainly in every address he delivered, that if they voted for Mr. Conger they voted for the Government, and the consequence was the return of that gentleman by an overwhelming majority<sup>44</sup>. Again, too, the Provincial Secretary was returned; in spite of all the opposition which was brought to bear by the member for Montreal. And in the County which I represent, we find that the Globe, with its train of sleighs, bells, and music, was there. Yet, with all these efforts, what was the result of the late vote? Why, one of the most triumphant ones that we have on record. And it was now a question in which the people took a deep and steady interest: shall the country be governed by a moderate party or<sup>45</sup> follow the banners of fanaticism and clear gritism.<sup>46</sup> And the hon. member for Lambton need not be told that it is vain for him to look to the country for a vote of the people to sustain him in his views, as he knows and bitterly feels that out of the late members returned to the House not one of them have gone over to his side or support his views. Another observation in the speech of the hon. gentleman needed some comment. It was argued that the Clergy Reserve settlement had not given satisfaction, and the hon. member for Lambton gave as a reason why the Administration ought to be deprecated in that House, was that the commutation clause was a fraud upon the people. Now, upon that very question, he would beg to put the question to the hon. gentleman<sup>47</sup>. He would ask, if he had not declared in his place in the house, last session, that "the effect of the commutation scheme would be practically to create a total severance between Church and State in this country."<sup>48</sup>

MR. BROWN was proceeding with some observations in reference to Peterborough, when<sup>49</sup>--

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH rose to order: a question had been put to the hon. gentleman by the member for Nort[h]umberland? which, instead of answering (sic), he had proceed[ed] to say what that gentleman had told him.<sup>50</sup>

After a decision from [MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER] ... on the point of order, and some further remarks from MR. BROWN,<sup>51</sup>

MR. S. SMITH continued.<sup>52</sup>--Yes. The hon. gentleman made that assertion then; and if that were the effect of the commutation scheme as proposed and carried out by the Government, how, he should like to know, could the hon. member now take ground against the scheme or how could his follower, the ex-leader of the opposition, reconcile his opposition to that scheme now, with the declaration of his leader then; and assume that there is a perfect harmony resting among the opposition? For himself, he would say that he fully endorsed the commutation of the Clergy Reserves, as effected by the government<sup>53</sup>. He (Mr. Smith) recollected well, that during the last session, votes were given, over and over again, upon the commutation clause, and upon every division there was a majority in favor of the Administration. He could say, without fear of contradiction, that the country had never looked upon this question as one of money--it was always made a matter of principle. They had gone to the polls upon the distinct question that it was essential to place a final separation between Church and State. It was not a question of 10,000L or 100,000L, as coming by its arrangement into the coffers of any of the Churches; it was the severing of the connexion between the Church and the State--not whether some Churches would become endowed thereby, and others not. It could not, however, be shown, that the effect of that enactment was to endow any Church. The complaint was that, by the arrangement, we were treating with the Churches, and that no individual would be enabled to come forward to receive his portion of the commutation, without the consent of the body to which he belonged. That was not the intention. It was simply to guard the public from imposition on the part of individuals who might come forward to receive the money, and then be off to another country. This was the reason for the arrangement, and this was clearly and distinctly understood by the country, and would meet the approval of every Church, on the principle on which it had been adopted. The object of the Government, as of the country, was to settle the question,--whereas the object of their opponents was to keep up the discussions and dissensions incident to that vexed question. He repeated the object of the Government and of the bill was to get rid of them. It was judged better that in the final arrangement, instead of (sic) having to meet in content with clergymen, they should simply have to meet their fellow-men, (laughter) perhaps--laymen, of the same habits and feelings as themselves. The country did not wish to protract the discussions on this questions (sic). They had had enough of the Clergy Reserves, Heaven knew. In thus bringing the measure to a conclusion he was not prepared to vote that the Administration had done anything wrong. He was not prepared, on the simple testimony of newspapers, the Globe, and such like, to condemn them. He preferred to support (sic) them in the view they had taken and the course they had adopted, and he was very sure that the people would support them too. He met in the newspapers all kinds of charges against Ministers. He was not prepared to take these statements for truth; no honest man could do so. If the country had been disgusted, as these journals taught them to believe, Mr. Conger would not have been elected the other day, for Peterborough. The honorable member for Lambton was not silent on that occasion, either in person or in the Globe.<sup>54</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Indeed he was not.<sup>55</sup>

MR. S. SMITH resumed.--He was satisfied that the people approved the settlement made by the Government of the Clergy Reserves. If, however, it were found, as had been alleged, that there had been fraud in the settlement, then, indeed, the Government need not expect any favor from the people. The hon. gentleman went on to consider observations made by Mr. Macdonald of Glengary, and by the Globe, on the subject of the Legislative Council Bill and of Education. He maintained that the Government had fully acquitted itself of its duty in passing the former measure through the House and delivering it to the Council. For its reception in that House they were not responsible. The leader of the Opposition was as much responsible for the reception of those bills with which he had charged himself in their passage through the House. The leader of the Opposition had himself maintained that all questions were subordinate to those of education and representation by population. On the latter question, however, the country had not supported the hon. gentleman, and on a kindred topic the member for Haldimand had received a striking mark of the feeling of the people on that subject. The hon. member here alluded to the sentiments of the Globe of an earlier date, where the writer maintained the predominance of the question of education. The hon. member for Lambton, now the leader of the opposition, was at present quite ready to postpone all questions about schools. If, however, he brought forward his favourite measure, how many members from Lower Canada would rise with him?<sup>56</sup> He would like to know how nearly they accorded on the question of Representation by Population? What sympathy, what accord, is there between the leader and ex-leader of the opposition on that point? All knew the opinions which the member for Lambton is supposed to entertain on that point; and all had seen a statement in the newspapers which the member for Glengary had recently announced.<sup>57</sup> The Toronto Globe had called representation by population a measure of the most vital importance to the country. Where then was this great measure? Why had not the hon. member for Lambton brought it forward? Would not his supporters allow him to do so?<sup>58</sup> But was the member for Lambton himself sincere in advocacy of Representation by population? He would put it to the hon. gentleman on that point, and he would reply confidently "No." He would ask if that hon. gentleman were in favor of granting universal suffrage? "No." Yet<sup>59</sup> representation by population, if it meant anything, meant universal suffrage; meant that every man, woman, and child--(great laughter)--throughout the community should have a vote. (Renewed laughter.) Yes: he founded it upon the number of males exhibited in the census. But he (the hon. member for Lambton) could not know that there was any disproportion in the representation, if there was to be no dividing line.<sup>60</sup> The hon. member was not even consistent with himself; for although asserting now the claims of Upper Canada at the present day to a larger Representation than Lower Canada, yet in the Globe of 1850 he found a very strong argument against that demand, based on the ground that as Lower Canada at the time of the Union possessed a larger population than the Upper Province, yet consented to an equal representation in Parliament<sup>61</sup>. (The hon. member again read extracts from the Globe.)<sup>62</sup> It would then be "not only unjust but ungenerous and useless to demand more, and that sensible men would cease fretting and take what they could get." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The hon. member now expressed very different opinions. He is not contented with himself. He is at variance with all those with whom he acts. He is opposed to universal suffrage. He frowns on the subject of an elective Legislative Council. In short, he opposes every really liberal measure.<sup>63</sup> He wished to make a few remarks upon what had fallen from the hon. gentleman [from Glengarry] on the Police Bill<sup>64</sup>. The editor of the Globe says, the Police Bill will bring an expense of 50,000L upon the country. Where had he got his information?<sup>65</sup>

A member read the report.<sup>66</sup>

[MR. S. SMITH continued:] If the bill was to establish a rural police, he would vote against it.<sup>67</sup>

Hear, hear, from MR. J.S. MACDONALD.<sup>68</sup>

[MR. S. SMITH:] A rural Police was unnecessary, but a Police was necessary in all the cities and towns of the Province, even in Cornwall, whence the hon. member for Glengarry came. Now the Police in the towns were insufficient. Men voted for Municipal Counsellors so that they might get appointed Policemen in towns<sup>69</sup>. Would the member for Glengarry say that the existing system of creating police officers by the municipal bodies was one to be maintained? He (Mr. Smith) said it was a great evil, and one that loudly called for correction. He was not afraid of the patronage accruing thereby to Government. They ought to have the patronage. It was not out of reason that they should, seeing that they were charged with the responsibility. Still he thought it was not good that they should establish police throughout the country: it was not required. But if bodies of police were established by government in county towns, ready at all times called on to move to repress riots, it would be of universal benefit.<sup>70</sup> He defended the proposal of the organized Provincial Police Force, by instancing the inefficiency of the Toronto Police at the time when the Circus Riot occurred.<sup>71</sup> He was well aware that by the present law, the magistrate had the power to call out special constables<sup>72</sup> on such occasions; it was not always desirable to do so, nor were they, generally speaking, very effective.<sup>73</sup> The member for Glengarry had alluded to the Militia Bill. It was very true that he had himself<sup>74</sup> voted against the Militia Bill,<sup>75</sup> while he did approve of the Police Bill; yet he must candidly say that after much enquiry among his constituents and others, he found the country did not disapprove the Militia Bill. The French people, as might be expected, were not averse from militia service, and England did not find fault with her more potent military neighbour that she had taken on herself the assault on the Malakhoff. The hon. speaker passed many compliments to the bravery of the French army and nation. The member for Glengarry found fault with the Government because they did not say what was the kind of legal reform wanted. Now he considered that it would be very ridiculous for them to state that they were going to reform the Court of Chancery, or this or that particular matter which they might deem to require reform. It was very unreasonable to expect the member for Peterboro' to say all those things. Government had done all they could on that point. The ecclesiastical corporations it would be acknowledged was a ticklish question. He could not, however, go the length of the member for Lambton in this regard. If the incorporated bodies only held enough land to enable them to carry out their avowed plans with regard to buildings, &c., he thought there could be no valid objection; but he considered however, that it was not necessary to be eternally talking about them. It was better to bring in a bill to prevent the statutes becoming so much more voluminous than they already were<sup>76</sup> by providing a general Incorporation Act.<sup>77</sup> Such a bill he would support. It was a step in advance, and in the right direction, and if members opposite found fault with the meagreness of the speech, they should be well content with a measure which would sweep away the greater part of the legislation of the session at once.<sup>78</sup> He (Mr. S.) held the opinion that they were better not incorporate[d]; but that, if incorporated, they should only hold such a quantity of land as would be necessary<sup>79</sup>. He concluded by saying he supported Ministers because he believed them to be acting in accordance with the interests and wishes of the people, and should not withdraw his support until he was given some better reason than he had yet been furnished with.<sup>80</sup>

The second paragraph of the resolutions proposed by Mr. Evanturel was then carried as follows:

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded.<sup>81</sup>

(33)

*And the second paragraph being again read, was agreed to.*

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER having put the question on the ... third resolution:<sup>82</sup>

MR. BROWN rose and said--Mr. Speaker, I have delayed rising to address the House, in the assured expectation that we would have received, long ere this, from the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, those full and candid explanations as to the action that has been taken, during the recess, on certain great public questions, which we had a right to expect, before being called on to vote on this address. (Hear, hear.) I think, Sir, we were entitled to know what action has been taken, during the recess, towards commutation of the Clergy Reserve stipends--to what extent commutation has proceeded--the names and ages of the parties--and the sums paid to them respectively. (Hear, hear.) And after the startling statements which have gone abroad, I think we were entitled to know clearly the principle on which the clergy have been commuted with--whether on the actual stipends they were receiving at the time of the passing of the Imperial Statute, or on some specious calculations as to what they might have received under circumstances different from those which actually existed. (Hear, hear.) I think, Sir, that we were also entitled to know what action has been taken upon the Seigniorial Bill of last session--what is likely to be the result of the judicial submission--what progress the Commissioners have made--and, especially whether the statements of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, as to the cost to be entailed upon the country by the measure, are likely to be borne out, or a much larger sum than was anticipated, saddled on the country. (Hear, hear.) I cannot but think, moreover, that the House should have been told something of those Ministerial missions to Europe, of which we have heard so much. One member of the Government left us, it was understood, somewhat in the capacity of Ambassador to the French. (Hear, hear.) A great deal has been said about that mission of the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands to Paris, and great results were expected to flow from it--and was no information to be given to the House on so interesting a matter, or in regard to the mission of the gentleman who came from the French Government to Canada, and from which we were assured so much advantage would result? And hon. gentlemen opposite ought to have explained what took the Inspector General to England--what took the Prime Minister of the Province to England, and the Receiver-General, and the President of the Legislative Council--and what benefit the public of Canada were to derive from all these missions. The House was entitled, too, to know what had been done in regard to the Ordnance Lands, in fulfilment of the assurances of the Administration that an immense amount of valuable property was to be handed over to the Province by the Imperial Government, and that they were going to England to secure it. But here we are in the third day of the debate, without one word of explanation on any one of these important topics; and members are called upon to declare their opinions on these the leading questions of the day, in utter ignorance of the facts. (Hear,

hear.) The studied concealment of matters so necessary to a prudent consideration of public affairs is a marked feature in the policy of this Government; and it is strange and deplorable to see how gentlemen opposite adopt by wholesale the congratulatory phrases demanded from them by the ministry, without the slightest information to guide their convictions. But the hon. gentlemen opposite withhold all explanations, and the house must just discuss the questions before them with the light they possessed. Mr. Brown went on to say that he proposed entering at some length into a review of the whole career and proceedings of the Administration, but before doing so, as the hour of adjournment was close at hand, he would fill up the time with a few observations in reply to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Sidney Smith.) And in the first place he would take the liberty of saying to that hon. gentleman that it would have been much better and more consistent with his position, had he spoken of matters of such serious import with a little more gravity than he did. The hon. gentleman was pleased to designate him (Mr. Brown) as the leader of the Opposition, and he was pleased further to insinuate that there had been some division or quarrel between his hon. friend from Glengarry and himself--that his hon. friend had formerly been leader of the Opposition, but that he had descended from that place, and that he (Mr. Brown) was now the leader.<sup>83</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--Such was the report.<sup>84</sup>

MR. BROWN.--"Such was the report," says the hon. gentleman. Well, sir, there has been another report in circulation, which may possibly have reached the long ears of the hon. member, and it is to the effect that two of his colleagues in the cabinet have been caballing for the overthrow of the Premier (Sir Allan McNab) and the elevation, in his room, to the charge of the bureau of cattle and cabbages of no less a person than the hon. member for Northumberland. (Cheers and laughter.) The hon. gentleman, it seems, has yet to learn that the repetition of such reports is beneath the dignity of this house. The whole statement of the honourable member is utterly without foundation.<sup>85</sup>

MR. S. SMITH (Northumberland).--Who is the leader?<sup>86</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] There never has been and there is not now any recognized leader of the Opposition; and for my part I desire to repudiate all title to speak the sentiments of the gentlemen on this side of the House. There have been periods in the political history of the Province, when parties were so divided, and adhered so firmly to their distinctive principles, that a leader of the whole Opposition could advantageously be appointed; but the hon. gentleman who prates so glibly about the want of unanimity, knows well that the recre[a]ncy of himself and others to the principles they have always professed to entertain--the subservient manner in which they have fetched and carried to their Lower Canada allies--and the humiliating manner in which they have allowed the principles and measures of their party to be sacrificed for the petty gains of a temporary expediency--have so rent the Liberal party for some years past, that it is now difficult for any one man to occupy the position of leader of the Opposition.<sup>87</sup>

Cheers from the Opposition.<sup>88</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] Sir, I seek in no shape to deny--I am perfectly free to admit that there are variances of opinion between gentlemen on this side [of] the house,--<sup>89</sup>

Cheers from the Ministerial benches<sup>90</sup>.

[MR. BROWN:]--but it must be evident to the most careless observer that we are far more united, have more points of agreement, and fewer points of disunion, than the strange medley supporting the Administration.<sup>91</sup>

Cheers from the Opposition.<sup>92</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] And there is this very important difference between their position and ours--that there is no necessity on our part to be agreed; while the gentlemen opposite are bound to be as one on all important questions. (Hear, hear.) And that is the whole secret of our respective positions; we on this side [of] the house, hold to the principles which sent us here, and speak out our sentiments--and therefore we are in opposition; the hon. gentlemen opposite cut and carve at their opinions, cloak over their differences, smother up their dissensions, and by these means alone are they in power. We seek the success of our principles--they seek office and shape their principles and their policy to that one end.<sup>93</sup>

Loud cheers from the Opposition.<sup>94</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] Will the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, and those other professing reformers of Upper Canada, who support the Administration, deny that between their abstract opinions and those practically acted upon by myself, and those who sit around me, there is perfect agreement--that the whole difference between us is, that they cling to the Treasury boxes and will do anything rather than lose hold, while we stand by our principles, with office or without it? Will the hon. gentleman venture to say, that when he discusses politics in the streets of Cobourg, he does not tell his constituents that the opinions of the member for Lambton, abstractly considered, are the same as his own on almost every point?<sup>95</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--No!<sup>96</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman may say no, but I know that I speak correctly, and that the one dull complaint of such politicians as himself is, that "he cannot form a ministry." I know this is precisely the cue of the hon. gentleman who sits beside him.<sup>97</sup>

MR. CONGER.--No!<sup>98</sup>

MR. BROWN.--He too says no, but I tell that hon. gentleman, that had he said that no previous to the late election, he would never have placed his foot on the floor of the House of Assembly. (Cheers.) At every meeting we held together during the election contest, the hon. gentleman got up after me and declared, that there was scarcely a line of difference between his opinions and mine--that he disapproved of the conduct of the ministry on the points I had spoken to--and these were the very subjects embraced in the address the hon. gentleman has proposed to us, just as much as the member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.) Nay, sir, when I charged him with being a supporter of the administration, he indignantly denied it on every occasion--and had he not done so he could never have been elected. (Cheers.) I can show letters from his most intimate friends and supporters asking me to assist that hon. gentlemen (sic) in obtaining his election, because he was to be an out and out supporter of mine. (Hear, hear.) I could give scores of names of honest, sincere Reformers, who voted for him on this full conviction, and some of who[m] have written to me since the election, not to ... suppose that because they voted for Mr. Conger, they were opposed to the principles maintained by the opposition, for

that they only voted for Mr. Conger because they believed he would go with us. (Hear, hear.)<sup>99</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--The Globe told a different story!<sup>100</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Yes, the Globe differed widely from these parties, and the sequel has shown which was correct. They insisted that the statements of the Globe in regard to the Hon. Gentleman's Ministerial proclivities (sic) were altogether erroneous, but it so happened that the conductors of the Globe did know thoroughly the political leanings of the hon. gentleman--they knew perfectly well that when he came here, he would vote with the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury Benches, or with any other hon. gentlemen who might happen to have the dispensation of the honours and emoluments. (Cheers and laughter.) We do not desire to deny that on this side [of] the house there are differences of opinion--on the contrary, we speak aloud those differences, because we differ honestly on questions in which all are as deeply interested as we are--because we desire the removal of those differences--and because we know no other mode of honestly removing them, than by passing our opinions under the test of public discussion.<sup>101</sup>

Cheers from the Opposition.<sup>102</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] Undoubtedly, on ecclesiastical questions, and on questions in which the interests of Upper and Lower Canada clash, we do differ. Nor is it wonderful that Roman Catholics representing Roman Catholic constituencies, should hesitate to oppose what we regard as the unjust pretensions of (sic) the Church of Rome, when Reformers of Upper Canada, aye Protestant Reformers, unhesitatingly sustain and vindicate those demands. And still less surprising is it, that when the public money is unjustly divided to the advantage of Lower Canada, with the base consent of Upper Canadians, and when the feelings or it may be the prejudices of Upper Canada are trampled upon by Upper Canadians, to conciliate Lower Canada, Lower Canadians should be found to support them. I justify not such votes by the gentlemen of Lower Canada on this side, but I condemn fifty-fold the conduct of the unworthy Upper Canadians who bring forward such scandalous propositions and almost force them upon them. But with all this, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite from Upper Canada, professing Reform sentiments, to compare the views and the votes of the French Canadian gentlemen with whom we act, with the opinions of their fellow countrymen on the Ministerial side, and to say whether the section on this side ... [is] not the one with which the reformers of Upper Canada can ever hope to act cordially; are not the men by whom progress is to be achieved contains (sic) in Lower Canada if it is to be achieved at all. (Cheers.) I ask those gentlemen how they can justify themselves to their constituents or to their own consciences for allying themselves with the priest party of Lower Canada, and helping to crush by executive influence, the rising efforts for moral freedom making in that country? I ask them if they did not feel humiliated when they sat by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Evanturel,) selected by the ministry to move the address and unfold the views of the administration, and heard him declare his affection for the Government because of its conservatism--its opposition to progress. (Hear, hear.) And what must be the position of an Administration whose chosen mouth piece coolly tells us, that he came here for the express purpose of getting a railroad built with the public money from the City of Quebec from Nova Scotia to Halifax, a great North Shore Railroad, from Quebec to the Ottawa, and a Grand Canal from the Georgian Bay to Quebec. (Hear, hear and laughter.) Aye, sir, and that he would go against any Government that would not go for all these schemes. (Continued laughter.) That was

the gentleman who was put in the foreground to endorse the Administration--an ultra-Conservative and a clamourer for three local schemes that would swallow up the whole revenue of (sic) the Province for half a century to come! and unless he gets it all he will go against the Administration! We are told there is no disunion among hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches. Does the hon. member for Northumberland go for these schemes? The hon. member for Quebec has hoisted his platform, and says he will go either for the Administration or for us, whichever gives him his price.<sup>103</sup>

MR. EVANTUREL made an explanation in French, the purport of which did not reach the gallery.<sup>104</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I understand the hon. member to explain that what he said was that unless the Administration go for the North Shore Railroad, he reserves his right to vote against them.<sup>105</sup>

MR. EVANTUREL replied. He never said he would change his place and become a member of the opposition if he did not get the road, but if they refused the road, he would vote against them on that point. He would generally support ministers in any case, because he coincided with their general policy. He never could become a supporter of the member for Lambton.<sup>106</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I am quite certain the hon. member will never support the hon. gentleman for Lambton. I trust the member for Lambton may never stray so far as to draw such supporters around him. (Laughter.) But the hon. gentleman told us more--he declared he was dead against an Elective Legislative Council; and yet it is made an objection against me, that I should belong to the Opposition, and not be in favour of that measure.<sup>107</sup>

MR. EVANTUREL, on the contrary, was in favor of it; he only regretted that the Imperial legislation, which gave us a right to deal with it, also gave a right to alter the constitution, even respecting the representation in the Lower House, by a single majority.<sup>108</sup>

MR. BROWN proceeded.--The honorable gentleman has been misapprehended. He explains that he is not against an Elective Council, but he regretted that the Imperial Government had been called to legislate upon the subject at all, because the gain from a change in the Upper Chamber would not compensate to Lower Canada for the accompanying abolition of the two-thirds vote formerly necessary to the adoption of Representation by Population. A declaration of illiberality on the part of the hon. gentleman which must be still more humiliating to his Upper Canada Allies than the one he was charged with. The hon. member for Northumberland insinuates that the Opposition like the Ministry have been compelled to shirk certain questions--that we dare not bring forward the questions of Representation by Population, Sectarian Schools, and Ecclesiastical Corporations. The hon. gentleman, I can well believe, would desire nothing better--but let me tell him that he will find his mistake ere many days roll round. (Hear, hear.) On every one of these questions, and a great many more, the sense of the House will be asked on the earliest possible day. He will find that we at least are not so anxious to leave our seats and go over to the Treasury Benches, as to shirk any of the questions on which we are pledged before the country? And if such gentlemen as the member for Northumberland will permit me, I would venture to hint that it might be well for them to talk as respectfully as possible (sic) of the measures of the Opposition. I can tell these honorable gentlemen that there are questions coming on for discussion during the present

session, which will either compel some of them to change sides, or effectually settle their accounts in the books of their constituents. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Northumberland is a wholesale Ministerialist, but what does even he tell us? Why, that he voted against the Government Militia Bill, and that he will go against the coming Police bill, if it carries out the views recommended to the Government by his leader, the Premier of the Government!<sup>109</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--No! no!<sup>110</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Did the hon. gentleman not say that he was to vote against the Police Bill, if it went to establish a rural police?<sup>111</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--I said if it were to establish a Police in the Townships.<sup>112</sup>

MR. BROWN.--And what else is a Rural Police but a Police in the Townships? These are the paltry quibbles to which Coalitions accustom us. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the Clergy Reserve Bill, told us that I stated last session that the Commutation clause effectually accomplished a separation of Church and State. Now, sir, every speech I have delivered, and every vote I have given, show, on the contrary, that the effect of Commutation was to establish permanently what formerly existed only temporarily--the endowment by the State of two favored sects. And the audacity of the declaration was complete when it is remembered that last session even the hon. gentleman himself did not hold such an opinion. (Hear, hear.) He seems to forget that on this very point not only did he vote against the Government, but that he placed a motion on record in regard to it.<sup>113</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--What was that?<sup>114</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The House will find in the journals of last session, page 271, the following: Mr. Langton moved, seconded by Mr. Sidney Smith, "that it be an instruction to the said Committee to amend the Bill, so that no religious body or denomination shall be recognized as having any right to participate in the Clergy Reserve Fund, otherwise than as a medium of distributing the annual payments, or the commutation in lieu thereof, to the persons whose individual rights are acknowledged." (Loud cries of hear, hear.) These were the views which the honorable gentleman only last session was determined to have inserted in the Bill. His indignation was roused; he said a document had been circulated among the clergymen of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, by which it was sought to place all the commutation moneys in the hands of Trustees, for the benefit of the whole bodies, and he framed this clause expressly to prevent it. And I have got his speech here, in which he said that if that were done, it would bring down the indignation of the whole country on the Government. (Hear, hear.) I ask the hon. gentleman to deny now, if he dare, that that very thing has been done? And yet the hon. gentleman now gets up and endorses the whole proceedings of the Government--lectures us for not worshipping the Treasury benches as he does--and tells us that the whole country is in favor of the commutation! All this in direct contradiction to the amendment which he himself thought it necessary to place on record a few months ago. (Hear, hear.) But let not the hon. gentleman fancy us at all astonished at the course he has taken; he has made up his mind that the Opposition are not yet prepared to change sides with the Government; no grants for Cobourg harbours, or Peterboro' railways, are to be looked for in this quarter just at present. The hon. gentleman from Northumberland came out in a very bold manner in opposition to the principle of Representation by Population. He thought he had made an immense discovery, when he

got from the hon. member for Lenox and Addington (Mr. Roblin) a scrap of a newspaper written in 1850, six years ago, before the census of 1849 had been published, and at a time when we doubted if Upper Canada had at all progressed over Lower Canada in population. But the contents of that extract which he read, I am prepared at this moment to endorse to the fullest extent. I am prepared to admit that Lower Canada had a disadvantage under the existing arrangement for some years; I am prepared to say they should have an equivalent, and am ready to consider, with all moderation, what that equivalent should be. But I held then, as I hold now, that the arrangement should cease when that equivalent was given; and I believe it has been more than given already.<sup>115</sup>

Oh! oh! from the Ministerial Benches.<sup>116</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] I believe that this is susceptible of proof now, although it was not in 1850, for it was not till the census of 1852 was obtained, that we found how greatly we had progressed over Lower Canada. Sir, it is one of the peculiarities of the present times that a man in the position of the hon. member for Northumberland--a professed Reformer--an Upper Canada Radical of the purest water--dare stand up here in the way he did this afternoon, and scout the principle of Representation by population--should dare to tell us that Upper Canada with 250,000<sup>117</sup> [OR] 25,000<sup>118</sup> people more than Lower Canada--and his own constituents of Northumberland among them--should have no larger representation than the Lower Province. (Hear, hear.) I cannot believe that the hon. gentleman's constituents will thank him for the pains he takes to keep them in a degrading inferiority to the people of Lower Canada.<sup>119</sup>

Six o'clock having arrived, the house adjourned<sup>120</sup>.

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past seven o'clock.<sup>121</sup>

MR. BROWN resumed:--If I rightly understand, Mr. Speaker, the object of a Debate on the Speech, under our system of government, it is intended to afford an opportunity for a general review of the proceedings of the Government, and of the whole affairs of the Province, from the period when a similar Debate took place up to the present moment. It should be, as it were, a balancing of the public accounts, a settlement between hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, and gentlemen serving the country in Opposition. And I believe that it is a wise practice which has been followed in this country, to allow hon. gentlemen the widest latitude in the Debate,--to permit them, to scrutinize the whole conduct of the Government in regard to every interest in the country. Such, Sir, is my intention on the present occasion; and I believe I will be able to show that the present Administration came into office in a manner that was highly demoralizing and that their whole course in office has been most disadvantageous to the country, and not such as might have been expected from their promises and pledges. I have held the opinion for many years, that if the constitutional system which we enjoy in Canada is to be continued with satisfaction to the people and advantage to the country, it must be by adhering to those strict rules of conduct which guide the statesmen of Great Britain. I believe that the Coalition which enabled the gentlemen opposite to take their seats on the Treasury benches was in direct opposition to those rules--that the alliance formed was only obtained by an abnegation of principle without parallel, and which could not secure either honour to the parties or benefit to the country. I ask honourable gentlemen to go back with me for a few moments to Quebec, and recall the scenes which passed rapidly before us there. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in last Parliament<sup>122</sup>, under the Hincks-Morin Administration<sup>123</sup> there were three parties;

one consisting of the administration and their followers from Upper and Lower Canada; another, embracing about twenty Upper Canada Conservatives, strongly in opposition; and a third consisting of a very few Upper Canada Reformers, who held that the existing alliance of the Reformers of Upper Canada with the priest party of Lower Canada, was evil and hurtful, and who were therefore in opposition. To this third section I had the honour to belong--firmly believing that the great principles of the Liberal party of Upper Canada were being sacrificed for the miserable gain of keeping half a dozen gentlemen in office; and believing that it would be infinitely better for our cause that Upper Canada Reformers should stand in opposition, whoever were in power, than that we should hold power at the price of bringing reproach upon our principles and demoralizing our public men. In carrying out these views, the gentlemen with whom I acted were brought into direct hostility to the then Administration, and, as a natural consequence, we were often found acting with the Conservative opposition, in the same manner as we are now found acting with the Liberals of Lower Canada. As there are now points on which we differ, so there were then; but there were certain great questions on which we were thoroughly at one with our Conservative allies in opposition. We agreed that the only principle on which representation in Parliament could honestly and fairly be based, was that of population;--we maintained that an elector of Upper Canada was entitled to equal political influence with an elector in Lower Canada--and that the existing arrangement was most unjust to this section of the province. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches from Upper Canada, have all declared their adhesion to this principle, over and over again--<sup>124</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--None of us ever voted for that principle--it was Mr. Papineau and Mr. Chauveau.<sup>125</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Yes, and the hon. and gallant knight, and the Attorney General West; and the Solicitor General, who sits beside the hon. gentleman will surely not deny that he voted for Representation by Population?<sup>126</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH.--Read!<sup>127</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Ah, read! Well, I will read presently--but I am sure there must be Conservatives now in my hearing ashamed to hear their leaders shirking the avowal that they favored a principle so just.<sup>128</sup> This principle was one so just and righteous in itself that there was not a Lower Canadian who would not admit its truth. But the fact was that it was not the Lower Canadians who attacked Upper Canadian interests; they never feared Lower Canadians; they never saw them bring forward arguments to bring Upper Canada into a state inferior to Lower Canada. It was Mr. Hincks who first denounced that principle. He had never yet heard such arguments from any Lower Canadian as he had heard from Upper Canadians.<sup>129</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD here handed a volume of the Journals to Mr. Brown<sup>130</sup>.

[MR. BROWN] proceeded: The Hon. Solicitor General asked me to read any vote of his in favour of Representation by Population--well, sir, here it is. On 2nd March, 1853, I find this entry:--

Mr. Brown moved that it be resolved, that "the representation of the people in Parliament, should be based upon population, and the number of members of the House of Assembly gradually enlarged with the progressive increase of population upon a

fixed ratio of representation, and without regard to any separating line between Upper and Lower Canada."

And for the motion I find recorded Smith of Frontenac,<sup>131</sup>---

Cheers from the Opposition<sup>132</sup>.

[MR. BROWN continued:] ... Gamble, Murney, Robinson and others. On the 21st of March, a similar motion in amendment of the Legislative Council Bill, moved by Mr. Gamble, and seconded by Mr. Langton, was voted for by Messrs. Crawford, McDonald, (Kingston,) Sir Allan McNab, Shaw and Stevenson. And on 23rd March, a very similar motion was presented by Sir Allan McNab. I do not think the learned Solicitor General should have been ashamed of that vote; he has not so many good deeds to boast of that he can afford to lose the credit of this.<sup>133</sup> (Cheers and laughter.)<sup>134</sup> And yet these are the very men who now denounce us for demanding representation by population--simple justice to Upper Canada! (Hear, hear.)<sup>135</sup> There were other questions which they agreed on, and one of those was an elective Legislative Council; on that their opinions perfectly coincided. The present Attorney General [West] congratulated him (Mr. B.) on the speech which he made in opposition to that measure, and declared that the sentiments which he had expressed were identical with his own.--The votes of the hon. gentlemen opposite, including that of the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands, were recorded in favor of a resolution declaring that the principle of an Elective Council was incompatible with the system of responsible government. Up to a certain day and hour the members of the Government had held their opinions, and they only changed their views at the moment when they took their seats on the treasury benches. He then read extracts from a speech of Sir Allan McNab in which he declared his opinion that rendering the Council elective, would necessarily be followed by an elective Governor, and finally by annexation to the United States. Yet, he continued, in spite of these expressed opinions, he (Sir Allan) sits there and brings in a bill to carry out this very measure. Mr. Brown then read a speech of the hon. Attorney General East<sup>136</sup> saying that his heart was not with the Elective Council Bill; from Mr. Cauchon declaring the Elective Council inconsistent with the connection with Great Britain, and from Mr. Hinks also, considering the Elective Council as inconsistent with responsible Government. Mr. Cartier expressed at that time the same opinion.<sup>137</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER said there had been such a report of his speech, but he had three weeks afterwards explained it, and showed that he was in favor of a dissolving power on the part of the Government, but he did not make the absence of that power an insuperable objection to the Elective Council Bill.<sup>138</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Well, then, the gentleman was at any rate opposed to the dissolving power in principle, as he (Mr. Brown) had described.<sup>139</sup> And yet these gentlemen, he continued, had brought in a bill opposed to a principle which they had been advocating for their whole lives, and why had they done this? Simply because it was necessary to enable them to sit on those seats.<sup>140</sup> The Opposition in the last Parliament also agreed that if the Union of Upper and Lower Canada was to be continued, it could only be by the gradual adoption of a uniform policy and system of legislation for the whole country. We agreed that by the existing formation of parties and the subserviency of Upper Canadian representatives, this section of the Province was held in abject thralldom to Lower Canada, and that the controlling influence of Popery was felt in all public affairs. These were all strong bonds of union, and we often found common ground of opposition. Well, sir, we were not numerous--but truth was on our side, and in one session we broke down the Government, strong in

numbers though it was. Now, mark what followed. Mr. Hincks resigned, and the hon. and gallant (sic) member for Hamilton was sent for by his Excellency to form an Administration. And how did the hon. gentleman act? Did he raise the standard he had fought under in opposition? Did he determine to stay out of power rather than betray his principles and the professions of his whole life? Far from it. He sent all his antecedents to the winds--he called in his enemies--patched up a Coalition, and took to his close embrace the very men of whom the learned Attorney General had declared, but a few weeks before, "there might be Walpoles among them, but there were no Pitts;" they were all "steeped to the lips in corruption." (Loud cheers.) The gallant knight and his confreres obtained office--but what a price they paid for it! They passed under the yoke of Lower Canada Romanism. They agreed to abolish Protestant Church endowments, and to build up Roman Catholic Institutions by the aids of the State. They agreed to abolish the Feudal Tenure of Lower Canada, with money from the pockets of their Upper Canada constituents--though three times they had recorded their votes against it as a robbery. They agreed to propose an Elective Upper House, with all its organic changes and republican consequences. They agreed to trample under foot representation by population, and keep this section of the Province in subserviency to the other. They promised to vote for every Roman Catholic corporation that the hierarchy presented; and they took<sup>141</sup> two Reformers ... in the Cabinet,<sup>142</sup> Mr. John Ross and the Hon. Postmaster-General, as pledges of the unholy compact! (Cheers.) They did all this, that they might enjoy, for a brief space, the petty trappings of official life!--and all the excuse they could offer for the wholesale desertion of principle, was, that "they bowed to public opinion!"<sup>143</sup>

Ironical cheers from the Opposition.<sup>144</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] Bowd to public opinion, Sir! Men yield up the whole convictions of their lives--adopt principles they have ever denounced--adopt measures they admit to be revolutionary--and they call it, "bowing to public opinion!" Under a plea such as this--themselves being the interpreters of public opinion--what act of political turpitude may not be consummated by politicians? I can understand, Sir, how a man may conscientiously change opinions he has long held, and I can honour him for the candour of his conduct; but when we see a body of men changing not one opinion, but all their opinions--not gradually, at different times, but suddenly; all at once; in one hour of one particular day; I have no faith in the sincerity of the change. (Cheers.) And, Sir, when that day of sudden change is the very day on which the converts obtain office,--nay, when the change of opinion is at once the price and the penalty of getting office, the affectation of explaining the transaction is more offensive than the baseness of the deed. (Loud cheers.) I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me, how any possible good could flow from so unrighteous a transaction? Could anything more demoralizing be fancied than such a spectacle? But, Sir, I am told that notwithstanding all this, the Administration is "progressive"--that admitting all the scandal of the transaction, the bargain was a good one for Reform principles. Sir, I utterly deny it. (Hear, hear.) It is true that the profession of liberal principles and the adoption of certain liberal measures were forced on the gentlemen opposite; but they have continued to carry them out in such a way as to deprive them of all efficacy. I ask how it is possible that men so discordant in opinion could produce a liberal well matured measure acceptable to them all? How, for instance, could the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Cauchon), the most ultramontane politician in this country, and for many years the able organist of the Roman hierarchy of Canada, sit usefully at the same Council table with the Postmaster-General (Mr. Spence) who up to the moment of taking office went

far beyond me in the advocacy of Radical opinions? Or how can the gallant Knight, the embodiment of Upper Canada high-church Toryism, sit usefully in alliance with either of the two?<sup>145</sup> There were many on that side of the house, who only sat there because they could not see any better course to pursue<sup>146</sup>. Agreement is impossible among men so discordant; and the result could only be as it has been--very few measures, but a vast deal of jobbing and extravagance--the details of the few measures in striking contradiction with the liberal profession of their titles. Sir, I propose now to try the gentlemen on the Treasury benches by their measures, and I ask hon. gentlemen from liberal Western constituencies to give me their attention while I pass them in review and endeavour to show how completely fallacious is the claim of liberality for those measures. And first I commence with the Clergy Reserves. What, I ask, was the object of the Reformers of Upper Canada in struggling so long and so earnestly for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves? The hon. member for Northumberland says it was with them a question of principle, not one of money. Sir, I agree with the hon. gentleman thoroughly in that view, and I say that the measure of his new friends is in direct hostility to that principle for which we so long contended. (Hear, hear.) The Reformers of Upper Canada had [f]ound that the support of religion by the State and the recognition of particular churches by the State, had been the source of endless discord--of an amount of discord exceeding that from all other sources put together--and they sought to sweep away the whole of it. They sought to put an end to all clerical gratuities and endowments, and to leave all churches on an equal footing, to stand or fall by the inherent merits of their faith and practice. And if this principle was expedient and necessa[r]ly when Upper Canada stood alone, how much more so now, united as we are with a province differing from us so widely in religious matters. For myself I can say sincerely that in the active efforts I have made for the secularization of the Reserves, I have been actuated chiefly by the belief that the disconnection of Church and State, the entire stoppage of clerical stipendiaryism, is absolutely necessary if the union of the provinces is to continue to exist. (Cheers.) And I put it now to hon. gentlemen, commencing, as we are, a new page of legislation, whether it is not our duty, and our first duty, to seek some basis for the legislation and government of the country by which the scenes of turmoil and discord we have witnessed continually may be put an end to forever. (Hear, hear.) And what other basis can be found than that of holding religion as a matter between the conscience of each man and his God--as a matter too sacred for legislators to interfere with? (Cheers.) What other basis can be found than that of refusing to recognize any portion of the community as religionists, either by special legislation or aid from the public chest? What other basis of union is it possible to find? Is there any injustice in it? Can any one complain because he has not an advantage over his neighbour? Is it not evident that if we are to be constantly called upon, as we have been, to vote grants to the Roman Catholic Church to-day, and grants to some Protestant Church to-morrow, and if the clergy are to be continually besetting our door, begging for a little more of the dross at our disposal--religious feuds will be kept up, the public money will be wasted in the struggle of rapacity, and religion brought sadly into contempt?--(Cheers.) I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the house then, whether the demand I make for the total removal of this most fertile source of discord is not the only mode of carrying on the Union with any hope of peace, and whether we ought not to set earnestly to work to adopt that as our basis of legislation? (Cheers.) For my own part, sir, I am free to say, that if the scenes we have witnessed are to be continued--if by the subserviency of Protestants, Popery is to be dominant in the State--if we are to be called constantly to establish institutions contrary to our highest convictions--to endow what we regard as error of the most serious character--if our school system is

to be broken up at the demands of the priesthood--if Upper Canada is to be dragged at the heels of Lower Canada--then, sir, I say far better come to an understanding at once, and dissolve the Union. (Cheers.) The grand objection to the Ministerial Clergy Reserve Bill is, that far from aiding this movement it tends greatly to retard it. It has selected two favoured churches and placed them in a position of superiority over all others by permanently endowing them from the public chest with an annual sum far exceeding what they were ever entitled to temporarily. (Hear, hear.) And to show you how thoroughly the country--aye, and the gentlemen opposite who voted for this Bill--have been deceived by it, I will read an extract from the Government paper, the Leader, showing the representations made as to its operation at the time it passed. (Mr. Brown here read from the Leader of Nov. 1854, a distinct declaration, that in commuting with the Clergy, Government would have nothing whatever to do with the bodies.)

Mr. Brown continued: That was the doctrine held out to the people in regard to the measure--but how different has been its actual operation!<sup>147</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--And what of that?<sup>148</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I know it signifies little to the hon. gentlemen that they should deceive the country--that they should keep the promise to the ear, and break it to the hope. (Cheers.)<sup>149</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--Where was the deception?<sup>150</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The deception was that we were told the Government was to have<sup>151</sup> no arrangement with religious bodies, but only with individual clergymen, so that the voluntary system should be fully established.<sup>152</sup> But the hon. gentleman would perhaps like to hear the views of some of his own colleagues at the time they were persuading too credulous Reformers to support this Bill. I read from the Reserve debates of 10th Nov., 1854:--

"Attorney General MacDonald then moved the adoption of the third clause, which he said he had amended so as to meet the objection to commutation with bodies, that by receiving a large fund they might build up endowments as large as ever. He thought there was a great deal of force in these objections."<sup>153</sup>

Loud cheers from the Opposition.<sup>154</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] These were the fallacious representations by which gentlemen opposite obtained their Reserve Bill. The hon. gentleman absolutely introduced an amendment for the purpose, as he alleged, of preventing commutation taking place with bodies, and building up a permanent endowment which, as he admitted, was open to objection. Now I ask if this has not been precisely the effect of the Bill? I ask whether the Church of Scotland has not received 114,000L, or some such sum, as a permanent endowment, and the Church of England 300,000L. (Oh! oh!) Is not that the sum?<sup>155</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--It is not that sum.<sup>156</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It is not far from it. But I admit our ignorance--and I do think it a most astonishing thing that we should be asked, and that the hon. member for Northumberland, the member for Elgin, the member for Oxford, the member for Simcoe, the member for Perth, and other professing Reformers who support the Government, should consent to vote for resolutions rejoicing over the Clergy Reserve settlement,

without knowing anything about the facts. How can they submit to be treated in such a way? Will any member of the Government get up and tell us how much the churches have received? (A pause.) No! The thing is to be kept dark until the vote is taken! But it is of a piece with the whole way in which the country and the House have been treated by the Government. (Hear, hear.)<sup>157</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY.--The hon. gentleman saw the returns for himself.<sup>158</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I did. I saw the returns for a few moments and I found that the clergy of the Church of England commuted in separate detachments and at different times. I took paper and pencil and was about to take down the figures to add them up; but Mr. Dickinson begged me not to do so without the Inspector General's consent--which that gentleman refused to give. But I certainly took away the impression that the claim of the Church of England was as nearly as possible what I have stated.<sup>159</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE.--I copied every word of it, and it was as near 300,000L as it could be. (Cheers.)<sup>160</sup>

MR. BROWN.--But let me read another extract from the debates of 1854. On the 13th November, when the Reserve Bill was under discussion the following passage occurs:--

"Mr. Brown.--Does the hon. gentleman repudiate the idea that this clause enables the Government to commute with those two churches as bodies?

"Attorney General MacDonald.--Yes! The object of the Government is that there shall be no commutation unless with individuals, except in regard to Roman Catholic and Wesleyan Churches, where individual incumbents are not recognized."<sup>161</sup>

Cheers from the Opposition.<sup>162</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] These were the professions of hon. gentlemen--but has not the very opposite been realized? Has not the church of Scotland received 114,000L, which she can easily invest so as to yield 11,000L a year. 4,000L more than she ever received in any one year from the Clergy Reserve Fund before commutation? (Hear, hear.) And has not commutation placed in a superior position the Church of England which has received something like 300,000L?<sup>163</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--She has not received 250,000L.<sup>164</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Then there is something she has yet to get. Some claims have yet to be settled.<sup>165</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--The Church of England, as a Church, did not receive a single penny!<sup>166</sup>

MR. BROWN.--A miserable quibble! The Church nominally did not receive the money--but the hon. gentleman received it for her as Trustee, and holds it for her. (Hear, hear.)<sup>167</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--No one knew better than the hon. gentlemen (sic), who had examined every power of attorney and every account.<sup>168</sup> If the Church had anything left of the reserves, it was to the credit of the clergymen who gave it up.<sup>169</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It was highly to the credit of the Clergymen that they had done so, but he thought that this settlement would give rise to endless disputes.<sup>170</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--That could never be.<sup>171</sup>

MR. BROWN.--He hoped not.<sup>172</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--Thanked him for the wish, but feared that it was not a sincere one. (Cries of order.)<sup>173</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] I ask, then, those hon. gentlemen opposite who came into public life, professing to be opposed to Church and State connection, and to clerical endowments, and who got their seats by those professions--I ask them whether the Government have carried out what they expected? I ask them whether they intended when they voted for the Bill, that the Church of Scotland should receive a permanent endowment that will yield 11,000L a year, while previous to the passing of the Act she only received 7,000L, and that the Church of England would receive in the same proportion? I ask, then, whether that was what the Reform party have so long contended for? I ask them also to say if the Commutation paid to the Church of Scotland on a stipend received two years after the passing of the Imperial Statute, was what they expected? The hon. member for Northumberland at least cannot say it was--for I hold his speech in my hand on this very point, when he declared that "if the Government attempted anything of the sort, the country would hold them responsible."<sup>174</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--Whose speech is that?<sup>175</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It is the hon. gentleman's own speech.<sup>176</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--Well, I won't withdraw what I have said. (Oh!)<sup>177</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman does not withdraw it! Well then, any person who has seen the document circulated by the managers of the Church of Scotland fund, must know that they admit having effected commutation on that principle, that they commuted on 150L, although only 112L 10s had been paid in 1853. I am quite sure that gentlemen opposite must feel that they cannot conscientiously endorse a measure (sic) so contrary to their principles, and that the amendment I am about to place in your hands embodies not only their feelings but the sentiments of the whole Reform party of Upper Canada.<sup>178</sup> [He] then moved the following amendment: ... That the following words be struck from the third paragraph: "This house concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves"--and the following substituted:--

"It would have afforded this House sincere gratification had we been enabled to congratulate his Excellency on the final and equitable settlement of the long disputed question of the Clergy Reserves, but it is our duty to state that the Act of last Session has not effected the avowed object for which it was framed, but on the contrary, has permanently endowed certain favored Churches with large sums of the public money."<sup>179</sup>

The second measure of the present Administration is the Seigniorial Tenure Bill, and I think that an examination of its principles must satisfy every one that it has no pretensions to be termed a Reform measure. Here the hon. gentleman went at some length into an explanation of the Bill.<sup>180</sup> [He] taunted the ministry with the manner in which they had submitted to the plan which Mr. Hincks lobbied in the

Legislative Council, a measure entirely different from that which he had voted for as the supporter of the Administration in the Lower House.<sup>181</sup> He showed that the question dealt with in it, was a dispute between the landlords and tenants of Lower Canada--that the Government held the tenants right and the landlords wrong, but took the money from the public chest to appease the wrong-doers. He read a resolution moved by Mr. Attorney General McDonald in 1853, and supported by all his friends, denouncing the proposal to take the money from the pockets of the people of Upper Canada as robbery; and showed that a year after, that very gentleman introduced a similar bill and actually voted against his own motion, when proposed to the House by the member for Haldimand. Mr. Brown went on to show how cumbrous were the provisions of the Bill--and that the expenses of working it were enormous. He stated without any attempt at contradiction, that the mere judicial Commission to determine certain legal points would cost \$40,000<sup>182</sup>. The sitting of the court alone had cost 10,000L<sup>183</sup>. The expenses of the Commissioners in carrying out the Bill, would be \$200,000.<sup>184</sup> The 150,000L which had been voted for the purpose of indemnity would turn out altogether too little<sup>185</sup>. He commented on the probability that the decision of the Judges would be contrary to the expectations of Government, and demanded where the money was to come from, to meet the additional burden that this would entail? He said he did not doubt in the least that whatever money the Lower Canadian supporters of Government demanded for this or any other purpose, would be granted to them; for they had but to threaten their Upper Canadian Allies with the loss of office and the thing would [be] done.<sup>186</sup> It was said indeed that if this sum were given, it was on condition that Upper Canada might get an equal sum. But the ministry had steadily refused to change this "might" into "must;" and after all, what did the arrangement amount to, even if Upper Canada did get her share. Upper Canada paid two thirds of every sum paid by the united Province, so that the game would be extremely profitable for Lower Canada to take million for million, Upper Canada always paying 700,000L to every 300,000L paid by Lower Canada. The game might go on for ever with the entire good will of the Eastern Province.<sup>187</sup> But for one he protested against the injustice to this section of the Province. Upper Canada paid at least three-fourths of the whole taxation of the Province--and it was most unjust to make her pay for the settlement of disputes between the landlords and tenants of Lower Canada. And the injustice was the more intolerable from the fact that though sustaining three-fourths of the just expenses of the Administration, and paying heavily in addition for such local matter as that referred to and many others similar--the people of Upper Canada were denied their fair share of representation in the Legislature, and were kept in a degrading position of inferiority to the Lower Canadians. The honorable gentleman than (*sic*) passed on to the question of Education. He referred to the speech of Mr. Dorion the day before, as to the little done for education in Lower Canada. He reflected severely on their absurd intention of establishing three Normal Schools in Lower Canada--one for Roman Catholics, a second for the Church of England, and a third for all the rest. He also commented on the conduct of the Government in having taken a large portion of the Common School Fund to sustain priestly colleges. And turning to Upper Canada School matters he proceeded to show the insidious efforts making here to establish Separate Schools.<sup>188</sup> He declared his opinion that the great majority of the people of Upper Canadian Catholics as well as Protestants were opposed to separate schools. If one section had separate schools all must have. Now there were 3000 schools in the province, and if these were to be multiplied by all the sects, where was all the money to come from to pay all the schoolmasters. Beside, was it desirable to bring up the children of the country to differ with each other--Catholics, Episcopalians or Methodists? He thought not. But this was not all. Ministers were not satisfied with children being educated

in separate schools, the teachers also, must be kept separate from one another, and their (sic) must be several, instead of one Normal school, in Lower Canada. Why was this? The Ministry were not in favor of it, but they had been coerced into it by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal. That was the only excuse. Has the Ministry, then, no opinion, no conscience of their own, that they must submit to dictation of this sort! For his part, he would resign his office, if he held one, at once rather than yield to any bishop, whatever; Sectarian education was identical with ignorance. It had been so in Ireland, it was still so in England, where the state of education was by no means creditable. In Ireland, however, since the system of national education had gone into operation an immense improvement had taken place.<sup>189</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--What is the system there?<sup>190</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Would the gentlemen accept that system? He (Mr. B.), would cheerfully do so; and had no doubt, if introduced here, it would have the best effect.<sup>191</sup> And, Mr. Speaker, there is a bill in regard to which I dare say a good many members of this house are not familiar with the facts. During last session the Attorney General West gave notice of a bill to alter the Common School and Grammar School system of Upper Canada. Public attention was very much directed to that bill, and we thought as a matter of course that that was to be the only School Bill of the Session. We met in September, sat till December, adjourned over till the month of February, passed through February, March, and April, and had reached the month of May, within a very few days of breaking up, without hearing of any other Bill. But mark what happened.--Almost the whole of the members from Upper Canada had left Quebec, only a few remaining; nearly the last hour of the session had been reached; we were all preparing to leave Quebec, when hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches brought down a Bill to change the whole National School system of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.) We had been sitting in session for upwards of six months, and not a sign had the Government given of any intention to introduce a Sectarian School Bill. We knew there had been a great agitation on the part of the Roman Clergy to have a Bill forced on the Government, but we were fully under the belief that no such Bill would be brought forward. On the 22nd of May--we adjourned on the 30th of May--within eight days of the breaking up of the House--a motion was made by Attorney General Macdonald, that a Bill from the Legislative Council to facilitate the establishment of Separate Schools, in Upper Canada, be now read a first time. That was the first intimation we had of the Bill. I have it now in my hand, and it was such a Bill that many of the Conservative members supporting the Government, and none more strongly than my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Gamble) denounced it as framed to ruin entirely our Common School system. It enabled any five householders to convene a public meeting and establish a Separate School. The other provisions were of the same character; it would have destroyed the school system and made it entirely sectarian, every sect being allowed to have its own schools. Then notice what followed. You are aware that the ordinary practice with such Bills is to have them printed and sent to the country, that we might communicate with our constituents, and hear their opinions and be guided by them. But what did these hon. gentlemen do? We were many days' distance from Upper Canada, yet the Bill having been read a first time on the 22nd May, on the same day Attorney General Macdonald, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Cayley, moved that it be read a second time--when, think you? Why, to-morrow, the very next day. Before the Bill was even printed they wished us to declare that we would read it a second time to-morrow--a Bill which was to destroy the whole school system of Upper Canada, and only 22 or 23 members from Upper Canada in the House! I moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Hartman, that it

be read a second time that day six months, and for this amendment nearly all the members from Upper Canada who were present voted, except those in the Government; I then moved that it be postponed till the following Tuesday, and that there should be a call of the House for that day, to bring back the members from Upper Canada, and that the country might know of the serious matter that was proceeding. We were beaten by the Ministry, although a good many of their usual supporters joined us in trying to obtain a delay. The honorable member for Essex, Mr. Rankin, then asked for two days' delay, but they voted that down too. They would not allow us even two days to communicate with our constituents by telegraph! It is true that, in the few days we had before the breaking up of the House, we brought such coercion to bear on the Government, that they dared not proceed with the Bill in its original shape. But I ask hon. gentlemen who profess to be Reformers--who came into this House professing to be opposed to sectarian education--I ask whether that is a proceeding, on the part of the Government, which they are prepared to endorse--and whether, if there is one thing more than another in the course of the Government which ought to be condemned by this House and by the country, it is not this--a Bill which was pushed through, although at every one of its stages voted against by a majority of the representatives of Upper Canada--pushed through by the votes of the Lower Canadians. And although we succeeded in divesting it of its most obnoxious features, yet even at its final passage we had a majority of Upper Canadians against it. Such is another of the Reform measures of the present Government which hon. gentlemen opposite are so ready to endorse and approve of! (Cheers.) I come next to the question of an Elective Council, and I admit that on this question I am in a minority in Upper Canada. I am willing to admit that the people of Upper Canada are in favor of such a measure, and I am very sorry it is so. But all members of the Reform party must be aware that the bill which was brought in by the Government as a Reform measure, was a perfect burlesque on liberality. What did it propose? Why, that the Council should be elected for eight years--that the old members should be continued--and that there should be perpetuated in that House the same unjust system of an equal number of representatives for each section of the Province, which we are demanding to have done away in this. (Hear, hear.) I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that this is a measure that Reformers can regard with pleasure. The only certain effect to result from it, is to establish more firmly than ever, for eight years at least to come, the domination of Lower Canada over the Upper Province. Mr. Brown went on to say that these were the great measures of the present Government; and they were all unpalatable to Upper Canada Liberals. And the rest of their legislation had been still less satisfactory. He took up the Militia and Police Bills, as introduced last session, showing the enormous expenditure they were framed to entail on the country, without necessity or adequate consideration--and the whole end they could serve was to throw more patronage into the hands of the Executive. He referred to the appropriation of 60,000L, nominally for opening up roads, but in reality to be parcelled out to the supporters of Government, and held out as bait for the votes of the doubtful. He referred to the Audit Bill, about which so much had been said, and showed that, as it now stood, it was almost valueless, the auditor being under the orders of the Inspector General, and having no control over the accounts until the cash had been long paid. He referred to the scandalous expenditures of 1854 for piers and light-houses below Quebec without the consent of Parliament, and the promise of amendment which that exposure induced<sup>192</sup>. [He] condemned the Ministry ... for raising their own salaries even for taking arrears already settled, for the Baby contracts, and for repeating the wrong done by these contracts by making a new contract for a line of ocean steamships without consulting Parliament, and during the recess.<sup>193</sup> Mr. Brown then took up the allowance annually doled out to the members of the Upper House by vote of the Assembly at

the instance of Government--and showed the degrading and dependent position towards the executive in which it placed the members of that body. He referred to the extravagant and unfair mode of maintaining charitable and other institutions, and to the folly of setting up a Canadian Navy under the auspices of Captain Fortin. He exposed the monstrous impropriety of Cabinet Ministers sitting by virtue of their offices as Directors of a private Railway Company, and receiving payment from the railway contractors. He referred to the injustice done to Upper Canada by compelling her people to sustain their own Turnpike Roads by local taxation, while the Lower Canadians' roads were maintained with cash from the public chest. He reflected in the strongest language against the measure of last session to pay the Jurors of Lower Canada from Provincial funds, while those of Upper Canada were paid by local taxation.<sup>194</sup> It might be said again, indeed, that Upper Canada was to get a similar amount for local purposes. But what was the fact? that out of over 5,000L thus spent 3,500L was paid by Upper Canada owing to the greater amount of taxation paid by her. Besides there was a great deal heard of Upper Canada getting these equivalents. But no one ever heard of her having got them.<sup>195</sup> And he wound up by an earnest appeal to the professing Reformers opposite to say if these were proceedings which they could say in their consciences either they or their constituents approved? I might go on, said Mr. Brown, reciting such transactions ad infinitum. We all know that there is no end of these things; that our whole legislation is made up of them. And why is it so? How is it that measures so unjust and injurious are constantly adopted? The reason is simply this: hon. gentlemen from Upper Canada are so determined to be on the side of the government, that they will vote through anything rather than place the ministry in peril; none know this Upper Canada weakness better than the Lower Canadians, and well they profit by it. When the gentlemen of Lower Canada desire anything, they go to the government and say flatly if you don't grant us this, we will put you out of power. Who ever heard of their sacrificing a principle or conceding a point, yet they always carry their ends; for their Upper Canadian allies have not the courage to resist them. (Hear, hear.) I do not blame the Conservatives more than the Reformers in this matter, for both are chargeable with the deep disgrace of it. For years past, we have seen one government after another--the leaders of both political parties, striving which can humiliate themselves deepest at the feet of Romanism and French Canadianism. But sir, I say, that the time has arrived when all this must be changed--when we must have justice for Upper Canada!--(Loud cheers.) I ask those gentlemen opposite who vote through so unhesitatingly everything that comes from the Administration, how long the present unholy compact would last, if they were to vote on each proposition on its own intrinsic merits? I ask them if the gain of keeping such a Coalition in power, is any recompense for the degradation to which they hourly expose their own people of Upper Canada? They dare to taunt us with standing in opposition--that we are not numerous enough, forsooth, to obtain power. And why, Sir, are we thus? Because we speak out boldly and fearlessly our sentiments--because we will not silently see injustice done to Upper Canada--because we will not cringe as they do, under the dictation of Roman priestcraft. (Loud cheers.) I do not speak these sentiments for the first time. You all know that I have always spoken thus--that I did so at Quebec, where they were far less palatable than here, and standing almost alone--that by the utterance of such sentiments I have drawn down the bitter hostility of many who sit around me--<sup>196</sup>

MR. POULIOT.--You have been hurting our feelings continually!<sup>197</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman says I hurt their feelings--does he think that nobody has feelings but French Canadians? Does he think we have no feelings, when

he and his compatriots rob our pockets for Lower Canadian purposes with which we have no connection? Does he think we Protestants have no feelings when they force us to sustain Romanism in every shape?--Does he think we have no feelings when they attack our National School system and endeavour to destroy it? (Loud cheers.) Are our French Canadian friends to monopolize all the feelings as well as all the cash?<sup>198</sup>

MR. POULIOT.--We do not slander your clergymen, but you slander ours!<sup>199</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Sir, it is well for my clergymen that they never have put it in the power of the hon. gentleman to slander them--they ask no favours at his hands or of any other politician. (Loud cheers.) I tell the hon. gentleman that if he wishes his clergy to escape rebuke, he will best effect it by making them stick to their pastoral duties--by keeping them away from the political arena, (cheers,) by preventing their coming here as lobby politicians. (Loud cheers.) I tell the hon. gentleman frankly that while they come here seeking bills of incorporation, large money grants, and the destruction of our public schools, we will deal with them as political foes, and employ towards them the same weapons we do to other politicians. By these acts they make themselves public property, and as public property we will treat them until the system is broken up. (Loud cheers.) When I am attacked by a foe I do not allow him to choose my weapons of defence. I confess to being very much of the opinion of Sidney Smith, that you may preach general principles of reform till doom's-day without effect--that you will realize little real reform until you press home the evil to the evil-doer--thou art the man! Let any one look through our journals and our Statutes, and our Estimates, and see the amount of money, and the constantly encreasing power we every year place in the hands of the Papacy, and then tell me if he dare, that we shall not discuss the whole affairs, and the principles, and the tendency of that power without scruple or reserve. But let the hon. gentleman withdraw his clergy from the field of politics--let them cease to take our money--let them leave our school system in peace to bless the land--and that moment we are disarmed. (Cheers.) There is but one way to secure tranquility in Canada--and that is by the entire disconnection of Church and State--by leaving each member of society to carry out his religious opinions according to his own conscientious convictions, and without either aid or interference by the State. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) And when hon. gentlemen charge me with stirring up religious discord, I cast back the reproach upon them, and tell them that I am the best friend of peace, for that my whole end and aim is the total removal of the causes of dissension. I urge hon. gentlemen to ponder this matter well. Things cannot go on as they have been doing; the people of Upper Canada will not submit to it much longer, and it is best that we should have a full understanding now. True, sir, we are taunted that those holding the sentiments I have suggested, are but a small minority. Sir, I would recommend hon. gentlemen opposite not to underrate the strength of our position. The gentlemen of Upper Canada who sit around me, all holding firmly the same principles, form the largest and most united section on either side of the house.<sup>200</sup>

MR. J. SMITH (of Victoria) made signs of dissent.<sup>201</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman shakes his head--but if he will take the division list and test it, he will admit that I speak correctly. And I will remind that hon. gentleman and those of the same views sitting beside him, how changed matters would be should the gentlemen on this side by any event be called to the Treasury benches. I ask the hon. member for Victoria, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Biggar), my hon.

friend from Niagara (Mr. Morrison), the hon. members for Oxford (Messrs. Cook and Matheson), the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Niles), the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. DeLong), and other gentlemen on that side of the house of the same cast of opinions--if we were to-day called on to form a government on precisely the opinions which we urge here in opposition--whether they dare now stand up in their places and say that they would not support us--that in doing so, they would not be carrying out their own conscientious views and those of their constituents--views that they have always held and on which they were elected?<sup>202</sup>

Cheers from the Opposition.<sup>203</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] I am sure that if these gentlemen spoke out honestly their opinions every man of them would say that they only support the present Ministry because they cannot get a better--because they cannot get just such a one as that I have described. (Hear, hear.) And if these gentlemen really hold these views--if they desire an honest Administration on their own principles--why do they sit there bolstering up iniquity--why do they not cross the floor and aid us in establishing one? (Cheers.) Are they deterred by personal considerations--do they think as I have heard one say, "we do not want to see you Prime Minister?" Sir, I am sure I speak the unanimous opinion of the hon. gentlemen who sit around me, when I say that their one only desire is for the success of the great principles to which they are attached--and that personal aspirations have no weight with them whatever. (Cheers.) And so far as I am concerned,--in entering upon the course which I have followed since I took my seat in this house, I resolved to regard myself as a "Governmental impossibility." I have never, Sir, concealed from myself that the position I have felt it my duty to take upon this floor, and the bold tone of speech which I have felt called upon to adopt as a Protestant Upper Canadian, must so alienate me from the gentlemen of Lower Canada, as to forbid, for the present at least, those ambitious aspirations so freely attributed to me. I well know that it is not he who fights the battle that wears the honours--and if I can succeed in obtaining the formation of a Government pledged to carry out those principles which I value so highly, I will have accomplished the end for which I entered Parliament, and will retire into private life well rewarded by the consciousness of having done my duty to my country, and having aided in establishing those great and just principles of government, by which alone, we, as Canadians, can hope to reach that high position among the nations to which we are entitled, and to which, I am persuaded, we will yet attain.<sup>204</sup>

The hon. gentleman resumed his seat amid great applause on the part of many members of the House, in which the spectators in the galleries heartily joined.<sup>205</sup>

MR. BROWN again rose and said--I hope no one will imagine that I have spoken with reference to other parties than those upon the floor of this House. I have spoken my conscientious convictions, and have sought to address none but the members of the House. I trust that gentlemen from Lower Canada will never be overawed by any manifestation of feeling exhibited in this chamber. I shall be ready on all occasions to discourage it. When in Lower Canada, I stood almost alone in the support of the views I advocated, and I well know how painful these manifestations are to a stranger in a strange place.<sup>206</sup> [But] he had always met with a certain amount of respectful consideration, which he should be sorry to see withheld from his Lower Canadian friends, now that they were at a distance from those who sympathized with them.<sup>207</sup> I do sincerely trust that while they remain in Toronto, the

gentlemen of French origin will be as free to speak their sentiments as they were in the city of Quebec.<sup>208</sup>

Renewed applause on the part of gentlemen within the body of the House.<sup>209</sup>

(33)

*The third paragraph being again read, as followeth:--That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums.*

*Mr. Brown moved in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. Holton, That the words "this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves" be left out, and the words "It would have afforded this House sincere gratification had we been enabled to congratulate His Excellency on the final and equitable settlement of the long disputed question of the Clergy Reserves; but it is our duty to state that the Act of last Session has not effected the avowed object for which it was framed, but, on the contrary, has permanently endowed certain favored Churches with large sums of the public money," inserted instead thereof;*

*And a Debate arising thereupon;*

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied to Mr. Brown's speech at some length<sup>210</sup>. He said the hon. gentleman opposite had commenced by referring them to the principles adopted by statesmen in England, and had held these up for the adoption of this country. It would have been well if he had adopted a similar course, and had postponed the sweeping remarks he had made, to the close of the Session, when all the information would have been before the House. They had, however, heard a great many statements made, and frequently contradicted on both sides of the House; but yet such is the course that hon. gentleman generally adopted, that the more he is contradicted the more boldly does he make his assertions. It can only be in this way that the hon. gentleman has taken this extraordinary course at the beginning of the Session to bring up every subject likely to engage the labors and the consideration (sic) of this House, so that he may have an opportunity of saying just what he pleased.<sup>211</sup> [He] pointed out the inconvenience of moving amendments to the address except as an extreme measure like a vote of want of confidence, only moved in circumstances when it is expected to oust the Ministry.<sup>212</sup> In England, it was well known, the fashion of moving an amendment to the Speech from the throne had become obsolete. It was a most incorrect mode of procedure from the very reason that the facts are not before the House, and members cannot therefore form an opinion upon them. Generally, the leader of the Opposition makes some remarks upon the prominent subjects included in the speech, and the House at once goes to the business of the country. They know the value of time there much better than we do here; for they do not think of going over every subject which they know must be discussed again at length, thus wasting the time and money of the Province. The honorable gentleman opposite had roamed over every subject he could imagine as being an attack upon the present Administration. He disapproved of the principles upon which the Administration was formed. He disapproved of a coalition altogether. He has said that no government formed by a coalition can be a politically honest one. It so happened that there is a Coalition at present in England, and he would ask the

honorable gentleman, if that was not an honest government. He would admit that the present Administration may go wrong; but this he would say, that if ever there was an Administration formed desirous to do their duty to the country it was the present. (Hear, hear). It was their sincere desire to act for the best interests of the country, and the confidence which this house felt in them showed their wishes for the interests of the country were appreciated.<sup>213</sup> The honorable gentleman had to admit the soft impeachment, that they were all at sixes and sevens on his side of the house, that there were not three of them hanging together.<sup>214</sup> They had no principles in common except the great principle of attacking the present Administration. He has again and again through his long and able speech--for he would admit it was an able speech, although somewhat rambling--but again and again he had asserted that the present Ministry are only held together by their desire of keeping their seats upon the Treasury benches.<sup>215</sup> He would ask the honourable gentleman if the principles which he attributed to them might not actuate members on his side of the house, the only difference being, that one desired to retain office, the other to obtain it. (Laughter.)<sup>216</sup> The hon. gentleman again and again reiterated the opinion that a coalition Government could not be politically honest because they had no political sentiments in common. He (Mr. Macdonald) believed that the present Government, although having political antecedents (*sic*) of an opposite character were all agreed upon the great questions before the country. Now that the questions which agitated the country are settled, their sentiments were completely in harmony. He did not know one question upon which they did not think in common. It was all very well to get up reports to show that the Administration are at variance among themselves. The hon. gentleman knows that by no mode of attack can the[y] shake the confidence of this House in the Government. (Hear, hear.) But when he finds out that they still retained the confidence of the people, and when by open argument he cannot destroy that confidence, he tries to insinuate that we are at variance amongst ourselves.<sup>217</sup> It was an old trick which had now become stale, of setting afloat rumors of discord in the cabinet; and it was a favorite trick with a certain paper in this town.<sup>218</sup> He would, however, say that they were acting in perfect harmony upon all the great principles they intended to lay before the country, and in this they occupied a much better position than the hon. gentlemen opposite.<sup>219</sup> The honourable gentleman, although he had stated that it was impossible that he could ever take a part in the government, had yet imagined such a case. Supposing then, that the opposition were called upon to form a government, how could they do it--on what one principle were they united?<sup>220</sup> The hon. member for Lambton will go for representation by population, but will go against an Elective Legislative Council. He will go for one constitutional change, but will go against another. Upon these two great questions, of the highest importance, could he act with his neighbors (*sic*), the hon. gentleman for Glengarry. Does that hon. gentleman go for representation by population--could they act together upon that question?<sup>221</sup>

Hear, hear, from MR. BROWN.<sup>222</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued:] The hon. member for Lambton has managed to take up that great question and agitate the whole of Upper Canada upon it. He has worked it up in every possible way, and until it is settled he cannot by any means sit in the same council with the hon. member for Glengarry. (Hear, hear). Then take the gentleman immediately behind him (Mr. Hartman,) he goes at once for a repeal of the union.<sup>223</sup> Could the member for Haldimand have anything to do with a Government which would in any way sustain the interests of the Lower Province--that Province which he would fain cut off with a shilling?<sup>224</sup> He is not contented with equal representation with the Lower Province, but would cut them off entirely.

Showing that there is another great question which amounts to a revolutionary one, upon which that gentleman stands alone. So he might go over the whole Opposition. Take the question of Separate Schools. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion) does not go with the member for Lambton upon this question. He does not wish to do away with Separate Schools. But<sup>225</sup> when he [Mr. Brown] made these attacks upon the Ministry, and taunted them with being a Coalition, he should recollect that if their opponents became a Ministry, they too would be a Coalition Ministry twenty times over.<sup>226</sup> Although the hon. gentleman opposite now talks of a Coalition Gover[n]ment as being necessarily dishonest, he did not always think so. He has got a new fight upon this subject. The day was when he labored in favor of a Coalition.<sup>227</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It is not so.<sup>228</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD:] The hon. gentleman says it is not so. He would read an extract from the Globe of 1854 to bear out his statement. (The Hon. Att'y Gen. here read the extract showing that the paper of that day looked forward to the time when the reformers and the progressive conservatives would be found in the same harness working together.) He said the hon. gentleman made no opposition to a coalition at that time, but just wished the conservative party to lay aside their old prejudices, and he would have no objection to open his arms to receive them.<sup>229</sup> At the general election the hon. member had supported him (Mr. McD), the Inspector General and Sir Allan McNab, all conservatives. He was then holding out every possible bribe to the conservatives. All differences were held as nothing, but because they would not go with him he changed all at once, and began to think with horror of such coalitions. The coalition to a certain degree did reward him, inasmuch as the conservatives put him in for Lambton, because they knew he was going to make a formidable onslaught on the late administration, and to that he owed his seat in the House. He attacked them for advocating an equal representation of both sections in Parliament. He and his colleagues were not unwilling to uphold the bill of 1841, giving equal representation to both sections of the Province; and they had opposed any and every proposition to increase the present number of representatives.<sup>230</sup> He was willing to keep by the number 84, and thought it but fair to Lower Canada to keep it so. Upper Canada had the advantage for a great many years when they were in the minority, and the Conservatives argued that if that principle was going to be attacked; if the compact ... made in 1841 ... was to be destroyed, the only just principle upon which they should go was representation by population. But he gave his vote for preserving the compact and for retaining the number of 42 representatives from each Province.<sup>231</sup> That is what the honorable gentleman calls inconsistency, to say that this country is suffering because the representation of Upper Canada is not increased--because she happens at this moment to have a somewhat larger population than Lower Canada, although Lower Canada, when she was in the majority, consented to an equality in the representation. It is a strange proof of consistency, or inconsistency, that the honorable gentleman who has taken a very active part in political discussion, and who commanded a press during all the time that Upper Canada was in a minority, never, either in his paper, or in a speech, urged the advantage of representation of population--and the reason was apparent: Upper Canada was then a gainer by the bargain; she was in a minority as to population, yet possessed an equality as to representation; now she has the advantage in point of population, and the hon. gentleman would take advantage of it, and try to throw the balance of power all into one scale. The extract read by the hon. member for Northumberland from the Globe, stating that the agitation of this question in 1850 was "unwise and ungenerous," exactly describes the position of the question. But the member for Lambton went further than all this.--He charged the Ministry with

having abandoned their political convictions. He said that he looked upon it as perfectly natural for men to change their views from time to time; but he makes it a ground of complaint that the Ministry changed their convictions in "one day". Now he (Attorney General) affirmed that to be a calumny, (hear) a calumny almost grown stale, but revived from day to day.--The newspaper of the hon. gentleman disproved the charge. The Globe at the time of the formation of the present ministry commended the course taken by the gallant premier, commended his speech at the hustings, and pronounced his policy to be wise and statesmanlike. It would no doubt be fresh in the recollection of hon. gentlemen, that when the members of the present administration presented themselves at the hustings, they stated frankly, that on the grave question of the Clergy Reserves, they would bow to the decision of the people. They saw that the majority of the people of Canada were bent upon having the secularization carried out.--They saw that it was inevitable that the minority, holding the opinions he had always advocated, might prolong the contest, but could not prevent its final consummation. They saw that it was an inevitable necessity, and that every consideration of prudence and statesmanship urged them to yield. The gallant Premier said that in his opinion it was an inevitable necessity, and he would not, consequently, any longer resist it. Well, the Globe so far from having charged them with having changed their convictions through improper motives, accepted the gallant Premier at once, came out, week after week, writing him up with as much care as it now exhibits in striving to write him down; and not merely that, but it also expressed an ardent wish that he (Attorney General) should go down to Renfrew for the purpose of opposing the former Inspector General of this Province! So much with regard to the consistency exhibited by the member for Lambton himself. Now with regard to the charge of inconsistency exhibited by the ministry on the subject of an Elective Legislative Council. It had always been his anxious desire in Parliament to adhere closely to the British Constitution (sic). But he knew that the majority of the people of Upper Canada were in favor of an Elective Council. He knew that the Council had ceased in a great measure then to show an independent course of action. He knew that a small majority only were opposed to the project of an Elective Council. Then he endeavored to frame such a bill as would save the constitution from being destroyed, to frame such a bill as would not interfere with the working of Responsible Government, to frame such a bill as would introduce the checks necessary for the preservation of the balances required by the British Constitution, and not to run any risk of sweeping it away and bringing in instead the system of the neighboring republic. And he believed, that though the hon. member denounced that measure, it would be found that it contained all the checks necessary to make the working of the proposed Elective Legislative Council perfectly harmonious with responsible government; and to render the whole executive responsible to the people through the Lower House, as it in effect is, and must continue to be from the purse strings being held by the House. Well, the hon. member proceeded to attack the administration for their Clergy Reserves Bill. That is the old hobby. It was a sad day for the member for Lambton when that bill passed. That day his locks were shorn, and Sampson (sic) was deprived of his strength. He knew, and the House knew, that if there ever was a time when the people of this country were satisfied with the state of public affairs; if ever there was a time when they ceased to pay attention to strife and agitation, and attended quietly to their ordinary avocations, it is now. There never was a time since Canada was Canada, when the people were more quietly engaged in developing the material resources of the Province, than the present. And that perfect quiet and content have been caused by the passage of the Clergy Reserve Bill. The settlement of that question destroyed for ever the hope of the member for Lambton, in being able to work on the ill feelings of the people.<sup>232</sup>

Hear, hear, from the ministerial benches.<sup>233</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued:] As long as that question remained unsettled father was arrayed against son, neighbour against neig[h]bour; and he believed that the administration had done a right good work in wholly removing that fertile source of agitation. Whatever subjects of importance, whatever questions of political exigency may hereafter arise, it is at least satisfactory to know that that question, involving religious principles, and working up the worst passions of the people, is removed for ever. The hon. gentlemen (sic) brings up the old story of the commutation scheme--the old allegation that it was intended to have the effect of erecting and endowing certain favored churches. He (Attorney Gen.) said that it was nothing of the kind. He said that it was not drawn for the purpose, and had not that effect. In the speech made--already referred to by the member for Northumberland, by the member for Lambton in the Legislature at the time that clause was under consideration, the hon. gentlem'n admitted that the immediate and direct effect of the commutation clause would be a complete severance of Church and State. Yet, though his admission was proof that all his political wishes and prejudices on that point had been completely satisfied by the passage of that clause by the house, he would not now give the Government credit for having introduced a good measure, and even went so far as to accuse them of having framed it for a purpose which they never had in view. He would no doubt now say that the object was to endow churches, not to give individual clergyman (sic) the stipends to which they were fairly entitled. That very subject had been as fully discussed when the bill was before the house as any subject could possibly be. There never was a doubt on the mind of any man as to the meaning of that clause. It was made so plain that he who runs may read. They refused to give a round sum to any one Church, for fear of the cry that would be raised that it was the intention of the Government to endow Churches. Then it was resolved that as it was not to be given to Churches as Churches, it should be given to the individual clergymen entitled to receive stipends from the reserves. But in order to prevent fraud, in order that the individuals might not draw their stipends, put them in their pockets and walk off from their congregations, leaving their churches empty, the clause was specially framed in such a manner that the clergymen, in order to draw the money, should first obtain the consent of their churches. The money was there for them to draw, but before they could get it, they must give security to their churches that they would not abandon their flocks; and that was fully understood by every person in the House and out of the house. He then shewed, and he would still urge, that individuals could draw their money, and put it in a common purse if they were so inclined, and it was impossible to prevent that, even if there had been no commutation clause at all. Under the Imperial act, the stipends must necessarily be paid to the clergymen during their lives, or during their incumbencies; and if there were no commutation clause at all, they could certainly have gone to an insurance office and made arrangements there.<sup>234</sup> But there was this advantage gained by commutation. So long as there was no commutation the fund would require to have been kept up until the claim of every incumbent was satisfied, and consequently the municipalities would never have received a farthing.<sup>235</sup> A fruitful source of agitation would have been opened to the member for Lambton, and the name of Clergy Reserve would have rung through the country and the house; (hear, hear) but now that is swept away, and the hon. member will find that we are the gainers by the wisdom of this legislation. Instead of the municipalities being obliged to wait until our grand children are grey before they can draw the money, the whole will be settled in two years, the land will be sold, and the money will be placed at the disposal of the municipalities for the purpose of enabling them to carry on the necessary works of improvement in this young and rough country,

where the want of capital is most severely felt.<sup>236</sup> After some further remarks, the hon. gentleman proceeded to say, that when the Seignorial Tenure Bill was brought down, it appeared to him to be only a reduction of the duties paid by the censi-taires and not an abolition of them, and that the evil would remain. They therefore bo[re] the course in the matter of charging it on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The last item alluded to by the member for Lambton was the Separate School Bill. And he would say, that if ever there was a measure of real importance, to the Province this was one. This question had been thought a fertile theme for agitators in every part of the country; and from the opinions expressed on it, one would suppose that the present Government introduced that bill. But such was not the case. It was placed in the statute book so far back as 1841. And in 1850, a subsequent administration amended the act. Thus [it] appeared that the present Government were not responsible for the introduction of that act, with the working of which the administration had been taunted. But, he would ask, why was the member for Lambton silent when this bill was amended in 1850? He did not then signify his disapproval of it in any way whatever.<sup>237</sup>

MR. BROWN.--No.<sup>238</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD had good reason to believe that the member for Lambton made no speech against the Administration of the day on that account, nor did he attempt to write them down on the Separate School question, nor did he withdraw his confidence from them then; but continued to support them steadily for some time after. The hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that the system had originated with the present Administration; but he had shown that it did not; they were not at all responsible for it. Whether it was right or wrong it existed before they came into office. But a bill was sent down from the Legislative Council intended to remove some of the evils of which the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada complained, and in order to suit their views the law was so changed as to enable any five householders instead of twelve, to call a meeting if they wished to establish a Separate School.<sup>239</sup> Thus, it appeared that the only difference in the law was that five instead of twelve Roman Catholics might meet together in any Municipality, and establish a separate school on giving notice to the authorities of their intention of doing so. The Municipality was bound to obey that notice and see to the establishment of the school.<sup>240</sup> The hon. gentleman said that the bill as first sent down from the Legislative Council would destroy the Common School system, as any religious denomination could then establish a separate school. That objection would not, however, attach to the right of the Roman Catholics to form Separate Schools, as they, as a body, are in favour of them. And what, was the effect of that bill? Did it destroy the Common School system.--He denied that it gave them any greater control over the public money than the old bill, perhaps not so much; and<sup>241</sup> it was now by almost general consent, allowed to be very beneficial. What, says the Superintendent of Education on this matter? He could not be accused of any great partiality in the matter of Separate Schools, for it was well known that Dr. Ryerson founded all his fame on the success of the Common School system.<sup>242</sup> Dr. Ryerson said that the new bill would not affect the common schools; that if the separate schools were limited to Roman Catholics they could do no harm; and in his circular published shortly after, he said that while it extended greater privileges to the Roman Catholics, it enlarged the limits of the common school system in Upper Canada.<sup>243</sup> These, resumed the Speaker, are the two effects this act will produce. He was strongly in favor of the Common School system and believed that the extension of education by means of that system, was one of the greatest advantages<sup>244</sup> that the country can obtain. He would be happy if all persons held the same views as he does

himself; but it was apparent to every one that there were people in this country who entertain religious views and conscientious principles totally differing from those held by him and others of the Protestant religion; and it is equally apparent that they cannot be forced to send their children to Common Schools if they do not wish to do so. The member for Lambton might call that fanaticism if he wished; but his opinion was, that if the children of Roman Catholics could not be educated in his way, they should be educated in their own. People may say, if they choose, that Roman Catholics are used as political tools, that they are the ordinary victims of priestcraft. That is said every day; but it is far better to enlighten them by education than to deprive them of the means of education. Then they would be able to read and write. They would subscribe for the newspaper and purchase the book. Their minds will become enlarged by education. They will form their opinions. No well educated man can long be the tool of any other, and if there be any truth in the assertion that they are or have been tools, they will soon cease to become so. If then, the fear of the member for Lambton is that the creation of separate schools will endanger the common school system, there can be no reasonable grounds for it, if it can be shown that the limits have been enlarged since 1841, that the schools are increasing in number, and that the pupils are becoming more numerous. The reports of the Superintendent of education would afford conclusive evidence on this point; and would prove that the pernicious effects which the honorable gentleman dreaded were not produced.<sup>245</sup> The member for Lambton concluded by charging the Government with all kinds of extravagance. One of those charges was, that a large sum of money had been voted for colonization; but that sum had been voted by a large majority of that House, and in addition to it, public grants had been made on several occasions; this plan had been found of great advantage. And besides this there was an Improvement Fund, which had been provided under the late administration. These were the facts on which the hon. gentleman charged the Ministry with extravagance. We, continued the speaker, were then told that we increased our salaries; and he admitted that they had done so, and not only their own, but the salaries of the Government officers also. And he felt confident that the majority of the members in that House and the people in the Province would acknowledge the justice and necessity of this step.<sup>246</sup> They had now an efficient line of their own bringing European trade directly into their own country.<sup>247</sup> If all the members of the House were aware of the misery endured by the public officers--which was great and humiliating in the extreme--they would agree with him that the 25 per cent increase was not, in fact, a sufficient supply. The Ministry, it would be remembered, took office in September, and their offence in this instance was, that the salaries were increased at the commencement of the current year. They were also told that they had broken their contract for the line of ocean steamers. But he thought it would be generally agreed, even by those opposed to the Ministry, that their promises had been literally fulfilled. This question had been brought up in the House day after day and pressed on its attention; and the hon. member for Montreal was very anxious to have a much larger sum appropriated for this object. The first contract entered into by the Government for a line of ocean steamers was so unsatisfactory that it was annulled. The House was subsequently informed that a contract had been entered into with responsible parties in the Province, who could give the most ample security for its fulfilment. And he was sure that that announcement had been received all through Canada with a feeling of unfeigned satisfaction.<sup>248</sup> The raising of salaries had been rendered absolutely necessary by the cost of living. Many of the employees of Government had suffered severe privations in consequence of the smallness of their salaries.<sup>249</sup> The member for Lambton next proceeded to charge some of the members of the Government with being directors in the Grand Trunk Railroad. It was, most undoubtedly, true that some members of the

Government were directors of that line. But, he would like to know, what was criminal in that fact. The system was instituted when the Grand Trunk was first established. A certain number of Ministers were appointed to watch over the interests of this great Provincial undertaking; and such a course was, it would be admitted, absolutely necessary. Now there is war in Europe. Stocks are down and capital is scarce. What, then, would be said by the shareholders in this line, if a new administration were to come in which would have so little confidence in this great Provincial Work, that not one of them would take a seat at its board? Why, it would be ruinous, not only to the interests of the road, but to the country at large. Such, he sincerely hoped, would never be the case. After a few brief observations the hon. gentleman resumed his seat.<sup>250</sup>

MR. A. DORION (de Montréal) dit qu'il avait écouté avec attention l'habile et remarquable discours de l'hon. membre pour Lambton (M. Brown) et qu'il y avait trouvé beaucoup de choses dans lesquelles il pouvait concourir avec cet honorable membre, que cependant il y en avait d'autres sur lesquelles il croyait de son devoir d'exprimer emphatiquement son dissentiment. L'honorable membre avait commencé par répudier l'idée qu'il fût le chef de l'opposition en disant qu'il était évident qu'il y avait de ce côté-ci de la chambre deux ou trois partis, et que personne ne pouvait à proprement parler être appelé le chef de toute l'opposition. Cela était vrai et ce n'était que par affectation que les membres de l'autre côté de la chambre fesaient semblant de s'adresser tantôt à l'un des membres de cette chambre, tantôt à l'autre comme étant le chef de l'opposition, suivant que cela pouvait convenir à leurs vues du moment. Pendant la dernière session il avait souvent agi avec l'honorable membre pour Lambton, mais il y avait plusieurs questions sur lesquelles il n'avait pu s'accorder avec cet honorable membre.<sup>251</sup> Sur la question des écoles séparées, par exemple, et sur celle de ce qu'il lui plaisait d'appeler les Corporations Ecclésiastiques, il ne pouvait pas s'avancer autant que l'honorable membre; mais relativement à la clause sur la propriété de la loi générale de corporation et au bill rendant obligatoire l'institution pour l'enseignement ... [de rendre] compte de l'emploi des sommes accordées par le gouvernement, il avait maintes fois prouvé qu'il ne s'éloignerait pas de la voie que lui montrait son devoir, par la crainte d'une classe quelconque de la population du Bas-Canada.<sup>252</sup> Il avait entendu avec peine la déclaration faite par l'hon. membre pour Lambton, lorsqu'il avait dit d'un ton de triomphe: "Que l'on me montre un pays où l'éducation est entre les mains du clergé et je vous montrerai un peuple croupissant dans l'ignorance." Il ne pouvait entendre une telle déclaration sans se lever pour protester hautement au nom des membres du Bas-Canada avec qui il avait coutume d'agir contre une semblable assertion. Il n'était pas vrai que l'influence du clergé fût opposée à l'éducation. Cela n'était pas vrai, ni dans le Bas-Canada, ni ailleurs. L'histoire était là pour le démontrer. Il y avait un pays, et c'était le plus prospère de tous les pays de l'Europe, où les prêtres avai[en]t non seulement tout contrôle sur l'éducation, mais encore où ils exerçaient la plus grande influence sur toutes les affaires politiques et sociales, et où ils siégeaient dans la législature et le sénat; ce pays qui proportionnellement à son étendue et à sa population surpassait tous les autres à l'exception d'un seul par le nombre de ses écoles, par l'étendue de ses chemins de fer, qui ne le cède qu'à l'Angleterre et à l'Ecosse par l'importance de ses manufactures, aux états de l'ouest des Etats-Unis pour sa quantité de ... produits agricoles,—ce pays c'est la Belgique; pays où le clergé exerce la plus grande influence et qui y retient pour ainsi dire le contrôle des affaires. Il (M. D.) ne croyait pas que la religion d'un pays fait une barrière contre son progrès, encore moins un obstacle à l'éducation et il dit que c'était une calomnie contre la religion catholique que de dire qu'elle avait retardé l'éducation.<sup>253</sup>

Loud cries of hear, hear, on the ministerial side.<sup>254</sup>

[MR. A. DORION continued:] Il regretterait qu'on aurait pu inférer de ce qu'il avait dit la veille qu'il ne reconnaissait pas les services du clergé du Bas-Canada et les sacrifices qu'il s'était imposé pour la cause de l'éducation. Il n'avait parlé que de l'éducation primaire et il n'avait pu fermer les yeux sur le fait que dans le Haut-Canada et dans les Etats-Unis la proportion des enfans fréquentant les écoles était beaucoup plus considérable que dans le Bas-Canada; mais il était loin d'en rejeter le blâme sur le clergé. Dans le Bas-Canada le gouvernement avait fait beaucoup moins pour l'éducation que dans le Haut-Canada (sic), il n'y avait pas établi de conseil d'éducation ni d'école normale, et c'était pour avoir négligé ces mesures qu'il avait blâmé le gouvernement qui était chargé de pourvoir aux besoins de l'éducation. Mais comment pouvait-on rendre le clergé responsable des vices de l'éducation primaire, lorsqu'elle n'était nullement sous son contrôle. Les prêtres pouvaient, il est vrai, être nommés commissaires d'écoles sans qualification pécuniaire, de même que les membres du clergé des autres dénominations; mais il y en avait très peu qui fussent nommés.<sup>255</sup> J'en appelle à tout protestant qui a vécu dans le Bas-Canada: le clergé de cette province n'est-il pas aussi moral et autant en faveur de l'enseignement que n'importe quel clergé du monde. Jusqu'à l'année 1809<sup>256</sup> [OU] 1829 la législature du Bas-Canada n'avait fait aucune allocation pour les écoles communes, et la seule éducation qui a été jusque-là donnée à la jeunesse, l'a été dans les maisons d'éducation fondées et soutenues par le clergé et à même ses ressources privées. Des collèges sont maintenant établis sur tous les points de la province où l'on enseigne les plus hautes branches d'éducation pour la modique somme de 15L à 20L par année y compris la pension, et cela par la libéralité du clergé qui non seulement avait établi et soutenait ces maisons d'éducation, mais qui de plus payait pour l'éducation d'un grand nombre d'enfans<sup>257</sup> "pauvres". Je demande aux protestants s'il n'existe pas les meilleurs sentiments entre les catholiques du Bas-Canada et leurs compatriotes d'une autre religion. Le prêtre et le ministre protestant sont généralement amis; si l'un quitte sa paroisse, l'autre est prêt à signer les listes de souscription ouvertes en sa faveur. Les catholiques élisent quelquefois des personnes d'une autre croyance pour les représenter. M. Leslie a été pendant plusieurs années membre pour un comté français, de même que M. Nelson, et parmi les membres actuels je pourrais citer M. DeWitt ainsi que plusieurs autres. D'un autre côté, il existe peu de préjugés (sic) chez les protestants contre les catholiques, et ces préjugés ne se trouvent-ils même que parmi les classes les moins éclairées de la communauté. Non seulement le peuple du Bas-Canada a prouvé sa libéralité envers les protestants, mais si nous remontons jusqu'à l'an 1819, nous le verront (sic) envoyer un juif à la Législature. A ce propos, la question de l'éligibilité des Israélites fut portée devant la Chambre et résolue dans l'affirmative. Je crois qu'à l'exception des Etats-Unis, le Bas-Canada a été le premier à faire ce pas vers la civilisation.<sup>258</sup> Il regrettait sincèrement le discours qu'il venait d'entendre parce qu'il craignait que l'effet ne pouvait que contribuer à éloigner les membres des différentes dénominations religieuses les uns des autres au lieu de les réunir, ce qui devrait être le but de tous les membres de cette chambre.

A l'appui de ce qu'il (M. Dorion) avait dit au sujet de la Belgique et de l'influence du clergé sur l'éducation, il citerait quelques extraits d'un livre écrit en 1845 par M. Poussin, qui, dans tout le cours de son ouvrage, montre une opposition constante au clergé catholique de ce pays, à l'influence qu'il y exerce et qui cependant est forcé de rendre témoignage aux serviers (sic) qu'il a rendus à la cause de l'éducation:

"Enfin (dit-il) il faut dire ici à la louange du clergé que s'il a pris une part active dans la révolution de 1830, il a aussi depuis cette époque contribué

largement à répandre l'instruction primaire dans la presque totalité des communes du royaume. Les exceptions à cette règle sont infiniment rares, surtout dans les communes rurales, et c'est là un immense service qu'il a rendu à la société en général, mais en particulier à la classe pauvre."

Cette autorité n'était pas isolée. M. Guizot, quoique protestant, dans ses ouvrages sur la civilisation européenne, reconnaît les services que le clergé cotholique (sic) a rendu à la cause de l'éducation, tout comme Macaulay l'a fait, cet autre historien protestant dont personne ne sera disposé à répudier le témoignage sur un sujet où toutes ses sympathies devaient être contre le clergé catholique.

Il (M. D.) s'était cru obligé de répondre à cette attaque de l'honorable membre pour Lambton; il l'avait fait avec la franchise qu'il apportait ordinairement dans la discussion des sujets sur lesquels il est appelé à donner son opinion devant cette chambre, et il espérait qu'en le faisant il défendait les catholiques contre une attaque qu'il considérait injuste, et n'avait blessé ou offensé ni les autres dénominations religieuses ni l'honorable membre pour Lambton lui-même.<sup>259</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE commenced his remarks by saying that the question before them was relative to their young and growing empire, and it was their duty to consider how they should legislate for the welfare of their country. He would ask, if it was fair that a section contributing only one quarter of the revenue should say to them of Upper Canada, that they were an inferior race, while on the other hand, they of Lower Canada were a superior race. They cried out for a system of Police, but they were men of different forms of religion, of different habits and of different systems of education, from the inhabitants of Upper Canada. This would always be the case, and yet they wished to impose upon them a Police force totally at variance with the opinions and customs of society in Upper Canada. Such a measure never occurred before in the history of the world. When the coalition was formed, the Catholic Bishops said, that the Clergy Reserve must be meted out according to their dictation. The gallant Knight, (Sir. A. McNab,) advocated no secularization twenty years ago, but now forsooth, he turned around and said, "give me a place in my old age" and straight way the doctrines of secularization found him its firm supporter. Would the gallant Knight describe the difference between his condition and that of Lord Bacon, in his (McNab) giving money to the French landlords, which was drawn from the pockets of Upper Canadians. It was a cruel and base act. Why did he do it? Because he obtained office by it. We were called upon to say that we approved of the spending of eighteen millions (sic) dollars, but how much had these little bits of railroads brought into the public treasury? Very little. He would not speak of the Lower Canadians as an inferior race. He admitted the benefits which that race had conferred upon the country. He admitted that the priests and not the bishops were firm friends of liberty. The speaker then proceeded to speak of the easy method by which measures were pushed through the House at its sessions at Quebec. Twelve persons could vote appropriations, and it was useless for him to remonstrate against their action.<sup>260</sup>

Faint expression of applause from the galleries and cries of order, order.<sup>261</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB suggested that the galleries be cleared.<sup>262</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said that it would be better for the hon. gentleman to take things easy. At Quebec he (Sir Allan MacNab) told the members that if he (Mr. MacKenzie) made a speech, the members were not obliged to hear it, and then commenced the rat-tattoo upon the desks, but they were in Toronto now. Thirty years ago it required twenty-three to make a quorum. If that number were not present the members walked

away till next day.--Under Mr. Papineau it required twenty-four to make a quorum. The speaker then alluded to the ambulatory system of government, and hinted that although burnt out in Montreal and Quebec they might suffer a like calamity in the building now used here. On the subject of the sale of public lands, he said that Lower Canada had realised 4,000L, while Upper Canada realized ten times that amount from similar sales. The speaker said that he agreed with the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Merritt) respecting a written constitution by which a majority should rule. Here in this House six men could choke down measures brought before this House. But how were we to get a change? The speaker then proceeded to remark that he did not wish to find fault with the Jesuits, but he did not wish to be governed by them. What could they teach? A little Latin, a little Greek, and the dogmas of their church, but in the matters of general education they were extremely deficient. Why did they of Upper Canada find fault with their friends of the Lower province? Because they had expended three or four times the amount of the public money which the Upper Canadians had. French influence had prevented the spending of the public money in Upper Canada. Their neighbours of the Lower Province brought forward a bill for the payment of their jurors, while the Upper Canadians gave no compensation to them. Was it fair that they should be taxed to pay the jurors of the Lower Province. The speaker, in commenting upon the time of holding elections, asked when were they generally held. It was whenever gentlemen of the Ministry pleased to appoint, and at whatever places they saw fit to designate. As to their public works, the speaker said, of the whole 100,000L, Upper Canada contributed 83,000L, while the share of Lower Canada was only 17,000L. We were a priest bought people, and we fairly deserved it. As respected encouragement to agriculture, they paid 15,000L and their neighbors (sic) 5000L. The Speaker said, that he had never held his dish for ministerial favors, and he claimed the right to speak freely and fully his views upon these questions<sup>263</sup>--

Cries of dispense, dispense.<sup>264</sup>

[MR. MACKENZIE continued:] Gentlemen from the other side cried out "dispense, dispense." Perhaps they will need the dispensation of their friends, the priests. The speaker then adverted to the subject of representation by population, and remarked in connection with it, that while Upper Canada exported one million barrels of flour, the lower provinces were obliged to beg 300,000 barrels to supp[ly] their wants. The speaker concluded his remarks by reference to the course which the Attorney General took in voting down one of his own resolutions subsequently to taking a seat in the Ministry, and spoke of the course taken by that gentleman in terms of strong reprobation.<sup>265</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY, replying to the hon. member for Lambton, quoted from the Toronto Globe, with reference to the charge made in that hon. member's speech, touching the commutation of the Clergy Reserves with the Church of Scotland, showing that, in 1854 the honorable member had persuaded the Presbyterian clergy that they would be severally entitled to commute on a stipend of about 150L<sup>266</sup> [OR] 160L per annum<sup>267</sup>; and now in 1856 he through the same channel stated they were entitled to only 112L 10s., and assails the Government and the Clergy for commuting at 150L.<sup>268</sup>

MR. BROWN denied the statement.<sup>269</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY, it is contained in the try (sic) weekly Globe of the 9th of February, 1856<sup>270</sup>. He was gratified to state that the total paid to the various claimants on the Clergy Reserve fund amounted to 381,981L, leaving a balance

divisible amongst the municipalities amounting to 312,383L. (Hear, hear, and cheering.)<sup>271</sup> The hon. member had said last session that the commutation would absorb all the funds and dip into the new sales.<sup>272</sup>

MR. BROWN, no, no.<sup>273</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY continued.<sup>274</sup> He (Mr. Cayley) had then said that it would take less than 450,000L. It was actually less than 400,000L.--He said there would be at least a surplus at the end of the year of 150,000L for the municipalities. There was more than double that amount. The result has been more favourable than even he had dared to hope. The prophecies of the gentleman opposite had been proved ridiculous. The sums actually paid out were, to the Church of England, 245,614L; Church of Scotland, 103,424L; Presbyterian Church of Canada, 2243L; Wesleyan, 9768L; Roman Catholic, 20,932L.<sup>275</sup> The hon. member for Lambton repudiated the leadership of the Opposition, and it was patent to the whole House that he is destitute of a follower.<sup>276</sup> The hon. gentleman has said that the administration held their places unconstitutionally, but it was a fact they held their places in virtue of their seats of office.<sup>277</sup> The Inspector General concluded by reading an extract from McKenzie's message, in which Mr. Brown was accused of supporting separate schools.<sup>278</sup> If reference should be made to the journal published by the hon. member for Haldimand, wherein prominent members of the Opposition are tasked for their inconsistencies, he (Mr. C.) could not but draw the inference that, under such circumstances, it ill becomes any of the honorable gentlemen opposite to reproach his honorable friend, the member for Northumberland, or any member of the Administration. (Hear, hear.)<sup>279</sup> Mr. Cayley here read a long article from the Montreal Argus, showing that Mr. Brown had supported both Mr. Baldwin and Hincks in all their schemes. At a future time he would go into some matters connected with the hon. gentleman, which the lateness of the evening prevented him taking up.<sup>280</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB moved an adjournment, and the House accordingly adjourned at a little after midnight.<sup>281</sup>

(33)

*On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until To-morrow.*

(34)

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald,*

*The House adjourned.*

APPENDIX: 21 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: TOWNSHIP OF DUMFRIES.]

MR. CHRISTIE [gave notice that he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to vest in Horace Capron and Myron Ames the allowance for roads between lots number thirty and thirty-one in the second concession of the Township of Dumfries.<sup>282</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ONTARIO HOTEL COMPANY.]

MR. FREEMAN [gave notice that he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to incorporate the Ontaria (sic) Hotel Company.<sup>283</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CORRIGAN MURDER.]

CAPT. RHODES [gave notice that he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, for information relative to the expense attending the arrests of sundry ... [persons] lately tried for Murder in St. Sylvestre de Lotbinière, also, information as to the circumstances under which the Montreal Water Police have been embodied during the present winter, and the expense attending the same; also, information as to the circumstances under which her Majesty's Troops were employed in the above arrests, and the expenses incurred by the Province on their account.<sup>284</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CLAIMS OF MILITIAMEN IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. LABERGE [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence, pour obtenir une liste de toutes les réclamations faites par des miliciens du Bas-Canada, pour scrips ou terres, depuis le premier mars 1850, contenant les noms des réclamants, leur résidence, la nature et le montant et la cause de leurs réclamations.<sup>285</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SEED GRAIN.]

MR. C. DAOUST [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence pour un état indiquant de quelle manière ont été distribués les cinq mille louis avancés par la législature, durant la dernière session, pour acheter du grain de semence, dans le Bas-Canada; à quelles personnes on en a confié la distribution, et quelles garanties le gouvernement a exigé pour en assurer le remboursement.<sup>286</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CHAMBLY ACADEMY.]

MR. DARCHE [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse à son excellence, la (sic) priant de vouloir mettre devant cette chambre toute la correspondance qui a eu lieu entre le gouvernement et les personnes réclamant les deux cent cinquante louis votés en 1854 et 1855 à l'académie des filles de la paroisse de Chambly, avec les noms des personnes qui ont touché cette somme, et la date du paiement de cette allocation.<sup>287</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND ASYLUM.]

MR. FERRIE [gave notice that he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause immediate steps to be taken for providing suitable accommodation for the Deaf and Dumb and the Blind of this Province.<sup>288</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: LUNATIC ASYLUM, TORONTO.]

DR. FRAZER [gave notice that he would move an] Address to his Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House a Return of the number of applicants for admission into the Toronto Lunatic Asylum as Lunatics, and the number whose application has been refused from the want of the needful accommodation, the said Return to embrace the last three years, and to show the number of Lunatics in the different Gaols in Canada.<sup>289</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: MEMBERS' SPEECHES.]

MR. S. SMITH [gave notice that he would move a] Resolution limiting the time for members to speak on any motion to one half-hour.<sup>290</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: TAVERN LICENSES.]

MR. A. DORION [gave notice that he would move for a] Committee of the Whole, to take into consideration the following resolutions:--

1stly. That the laws which now regulate the mode of granting Tavern Licences and licences for the sale of spirituous and fermented liquors are insufficient, and that it is expedient to provide in a more efficient manner by further enactments for the prevention and repression of intemperance.

2ndly. That no person shall be permitted to sell spirituous or fermented liquors in less quantities than gallons, without having first obtained a licence for that purpose.

3rdly. That the exclusive right of granting such licences shall be vested in the councils of the Local Municipalities, with power to make by-laws to determine the manner in which licences shall be granted for the regulation of Taverns and other places in which spirituous or fermented liquors shall be sold.

4thly. That no Tavern Licence shall authorize the person holding such licence to retail or furnish intoxicating beverages, or spirituous or fermented liquors, to any but travellers or persons residing more than \_\_\_\_\_ miles from such tavern, or to persons lodging at or boarding in the said tavern.<sup>291</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE RE: INTEMPERANCE.]

MR. PATRICK [gave notice that he would move] for the appointment of a Select Committee of fifteen members, with instructions to enquire as to the best means of suppressing the vice of drunkenness, and to report from time to time to this House--said Committee to consist of Messrs. Aikins, Chapais, Christie, Church, DeWitt, J.E.B. Dorion, Felton, Flint, Hartman, Jackson, Poulin, Sanborn, Tache, Wright and the Mover.<sup>292</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION RE: PETITION OF JOHN MAGUIRE.]

MR. FERRES [gave notice that he would move] that the Entries of the 23rd May, 1855, in the Journals of last Session, be read, with the view of expunging therefrom that part which relates to the Select Committee to whom was referred the Petitions of J. Maguire, of the City of Quebec, Esquire, and others, the same having been through a clerical error, inserted in the said Journals.<sup>293</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION: CLAIMS OF MILITIAMEN IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. LABERGE [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il] demandera au ministère si c'est son intention de proposer une mesure pour venir au secours des miliciens du Bas-

Canada, qui n'ont pas fait leurs réclamations dans le temps fixé par la loi pourvoyant au paiement de ces réclamations.<sup>294</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: ANNUAL GRANT FOR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.]

MR. LABERGE [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il] demandera au ministère si c'est son intention de proposer une augmentation de l'octroi provincial en faveur de l'éducation élémentaire, ou la création d'un fonds particulier pour cet objet.<sup>295</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: LANDS GRANTED TO HEIRS OF W.B. FELTON IN ORFORD.]

MR. J. DORION [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il posera une] question au ministère:--Quelle est la cause qui a retardé et retarde encore la mise devant cette chambre, de tous les documents concernant certaines terres accordées à U.B. (sic) Felton, dans le township d'Oxford (sic), tel que demandé par une adresse votée par cette chambre le 7 mars 1855?<sup>296</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES.]

DR. VALOIS [gave notice that he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether it is the intention of the Government to amend the Act 16 Vic., chap. 18, to provide for a better organization of Agricultural Societies in Canada, so as to extend the said Act to all the Counties constituted by the Parliamentary Representation Act, 16 Vic., chap. 152, as amended by the Act 18 Vic. chap. 76.<sup>297</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A BILL RE: SEPARATE SCHOOLS.]

MR. BOWES, seconded by MR. CRAWFORD, moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Separate School Act of 1855. The object of his Bill, he said, was merely to assist in carrying out the provisions of the former one.<sup>298</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that the hon. gentleman had not moved his Bill at the proper time. If he had given notice of it, the notice would be called in its order.<sup>299</sup>

MR. BOWES said that he thought that having presented a petition, and that petition having been received by the House, he was entitled to move at any time the first reading of a Bill founded upon it.<sup>300</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER stated that if that practice were adopted, it would give some members precedence with their measures, to the injury of others.<sup>301</sup>

MR. BOWES accordingly allowed his motion to stand over.<sup>302</sup>

[POSTPONED READING OF THE PETITION OF HILAIRE ALLARD, OF L'AVENIR.]

Sur la demande de MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB, la réception de la requête demandant le rappel du gouverneur a été remise après que les débats sur l'adresse seront terminés.<sup>303</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 21 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
2. IBID.
3. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
4. GLOBE, 22 February 1856. WESTERN PLANET, 28 February 1856, provides an explanation of the situation prevailing in the Crown Lands Department. It reads as follows: "It appears that the Commissioner of the ... Department has strictly forbidden the entrance of any outsiders to his mysterious office, and that he requires all questions to be asked in writing, to which answers by the same medium are given. As the members of the House are not generally deaf and dumb, and as they have generally a great deal of Crown Lands business to transact for their constituents, they find this mode of getting information very cumbersome. Hence a member of the ministerial party (Mr. Powel) and a member of the opposition (Mr. J.S. Macdonald) ... [have moved] in it, and many other members have expressed their disapprobation of the innovation. Mr. Cauchon, however, threatens to adhere to his plan".
5. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
6. IBID.
7. IBID.
8. IBID.
9. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 22 February 1856).
10. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 22 February 1856). This account faultily attributes this statement to Mr. J.S. Macdonald. The confusion can be explained by the fact that both Mr. J.S. Macdonald and Mr. Powell have presented notices of motion relating to the Crown Lands Department. Although Mr. J.S. Macdonald does participate in this short debate, the motion in question is presented by Mr. Powell (footnote 4), and therefore, only this gentleman can consent to postpone its consideration.
11. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
12. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
13. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
14. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
15. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
16. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
17. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
18. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
19. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
20. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
21. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
22. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
23. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
24. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
25. IBID.
26. IBID.
27. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
28. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
29. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
30. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856. The ellipsis represents an illegible word.
31. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
32. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
33. IBID.

34. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
35. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
36. IBID.
37. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
38. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
39. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
40. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
41. IBID.
42. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
43. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
44. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
45. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
46. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
47. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
48. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
49. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
50. IBID.
51. IBID.
52. IBID.
53. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
54. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
55. IBID.
56. IBID.
57. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
58. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
59. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
60. GLOBE, 22 February 1856. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, provides the following commentary concerning Mr. S. Smith: "His lank form swelled with pride, and his countenance gleamed with a halo of joy, as he welled up from his barren mind the new discovery, that representation, if it had any meaning, meant that ev[e]ry man, woman and child should have a vote!"
61. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
62. GLOBE, 22 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856, reports "the reading of this article elicited considerable merriment in the House".
63. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
64. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
65. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
66. IBID.
67. IBID.
68. IBID.
69. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
70. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
71. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
72. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
73. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
74. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
75. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
76. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
78. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
79. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
80. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
81. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.

82. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
83. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
84. IBID.
85. IBID.
86. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
87. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
88. IBID.
89. IBID.
90. IBID.
91. IBID.
92. IBID.
93. IBID.
94. IBID.
95. IBID.
96. IBID.
97. IBID.
98. IBID.
99. IBID.
100. IBID.
101. IBID.
102. IBID.
103. IBID.
104. IBID.
105. IBID.
106. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
107. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
108. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
109. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
110. IBID.
111. IBID.
112. IBID.
113. IBID.
114. IBID.
115. IBID.
116. IBID.
117. IBID.
118. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
119. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
120. IBID.
121. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856. A commentary in GLOBE, 28 February 1856, reports that "the House adjourned at 6 till half-past 7, when Mr. Brown resumed his speech. The galleries were crowded with the élite of Toronto. The House presented a most animating appearance."
122. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
123. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
124. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
125. IBID.
126. IBID.
127. IBID.
128. IBID.
129. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
130. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
131. IBID.

132. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
133. IBID.
134. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
135. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
136. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
137. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
138. IBID.
139. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
140. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
141. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
142. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856. This newspaper reports the following version of this part of Mr. Brown's speech: "The hon. gentlemen told them that this was a Reform Administration; that the leaders had changed their opinion; and that a great gain had been made--and they had given two pledges to this effect--two Reformers being in the Cabinet, one as Speaker of the Upper House, and the other the Postmaster General."
143. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
144. IBID.
145. IBID.
146. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
147. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
148. IBID.
149. IBID.
150. IBID.
151. IBID.
152. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
153. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
154. IBID.
155. IBID.
156. IBID.
157. IBID.
158. IBID.
159. IBID.
160. IBID.
161. IBID.
162. IBID.
163. IBID.
164. IBID.
165. IBID.
166. IBID.
167. IBID.
168. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
169. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
170. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
171. IBID.
172. IBID.
173. IBID.
174. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
175. IBID.
176. IBID.
177. IBID.
178. IBID.
179. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.

180. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
181. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
182. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
183. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
184. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
185. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
186. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
187. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
188. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
189. MORNING CHRONICLE, 26 February 1856.
190. IBID.
191. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
192. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
193. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
194. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
195. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
196. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
197. IBID.
198. IBID.
199. IBID.
200. IBID.
201. IBID.
202. IBID.
203. IBID.
204. IBID.
205. IBID.
206. IBID.
207. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
208. GLOBE, 25 February 1856.
209. GLOBE, 25 February 1856. In its commentary, GLOBE, 28 February 1856, specifies that "Mr. Brown occupied the floor for about three hours and a half". GLOBE, 22 February 1856, comments in turn: "At half-past nine, Mr. Brown closed his speech and was loudly cheered from all parts of the House."
210. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
211. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
212. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
213. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
214. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
215. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
216. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
217. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
218. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
219. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
220. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
221. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
222. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
223. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
224. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
225. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
226. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
227. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
228. IBID.
229. IBID.

230. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
231. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
232. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
233. IBID.
234. IBID.
235. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
236. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
237. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
238. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
239. IBID.
240. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
241. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
242. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
243. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
244. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
245. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
246. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
247. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
248. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
249. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
250. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
251. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
252. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
253. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
254. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
255. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
256. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
257. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
258. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
259. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, in another commentary, gives a detailed analysis of the history of Belgium as relates to education, in order to refute Mr. A. Dorion's assertions.
260. GLOBE, 22 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856, and MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856, state that "Mr. MacKenzie made a speech of great length and discursiveness, which it is impossible to report in a condensed form."
261. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
262. GLOBE, 22 February 1856. In its commentary, GLOBE, 28 February 1856, explains that Mr. Mackenzie "kept the House in roars of laughter with his bitter sallies of wit and sarcasm, at the Coalition in general and Sir Allan in particular. Allan got so provoked at Mackenzie's hints, and the approbation with which they were received, that he had the audacity to threaten to clear the galleries!" MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, also reports that "in consequence of some feeling of applause in the galleries, Sir Allan rose and harshly threatened to turn the whole public summarily out of doors, ladies and all, and then debate in secret conclave."
263. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
264. IBID.
265. IBID.
266. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856. GLOBE, 22 February 1856, reports the following comment: "Mr. Cayley rose about midnight, yet even at that late hour, could not refrain from his usual practice of reading long extracts from the Globe, on the hunt for inconsistencies".

267. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
268. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
269. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
270. IBID.
271. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
272. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
273. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
274. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
275. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
276. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
277. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
278. MORNING CHRONICLE, 27 February 1856.
279. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
280. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856.
281. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 23 February 1856.
282. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
283. IBID.
284. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
285. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
286. IBID.
287. IBID.
288. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
289. IBID.
290. IBID.
291. IBID.
292. IBID.
293. IBID.
294. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
295. IBID.
296. IBID.
297. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
298. GLOBE, 22 February 1856.
299. IBID.
300. IBID.
301. IBID.
302. IBID.
303. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 22 February 1856, provides the following report, which seems attributable to this petition: "Upon motion of Mr. Dorion of Arthabaska for the printing of a petition, an objection to the printing of such petitions with numerous signatures was taken, as a very large number of fictitious names had been attached to it. The subject was allowed to stand over."

FRIDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 1856.

(34)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of Thomas Solomon and others, of the Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; the Petition of the Reverend W.J. Mackenzie and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of William Thackeray and others, of the Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; the Petition of S. Vanderburgh and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Henry Ingersoll and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Alexander Neill and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of William Brown and others, of the Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Hugh Halligan and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of John Orr and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; and the Petition of Mrs. Dooly and others, of the Town of Cobourg, County of Northumberland.

By Mr. Macbeth,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Sutherland (sic), County of Elgin; and the Petition of James Taunton, of the Township of Southwold, County of Elgin.

By the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab,--The Petition of the Hamilton and Port Dover Railway Company.

By Mr. Alleyn,--The Petition of Miss Eliza Taylor and others, the Ladies Managers of the Male Orphan Asylum of Quebec.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company; and the Petition of J.P. Boomer and others, of Queenston and St. Catharines.

By Mr. Munro,--Two Petitions of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of John McMillan and others, of the Townships of Tecumseth and Stanley, County of Huron.

By Mr. Freeman,--The Petition of William P. McLaren and others, of the City of Hamilton.

By Mr. Ferrie,--The Petition of Thomas Chisholm and others, of the Village of Ayr, County of Waterloo; and the Petition of John Watson, of the Village of Ayr, County of Waterloo.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of James Edwards and others, of the Township of Oxford, County of Grenville; and of D.J. Hughes and others, of the Town of St. Thomas, County of Elgin; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of Horace Capron and others, of the Township of South Dumfries; praying for the passing of an Act vesting in Horace Capron and Myron Ames, a certain Road allowance, between Lots numbers thirty and thirty-one, in the second concession of the Township of South Dumfries.

Of the Corporation of the College of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, praying for aid to enlarge the said College.

(35)

Of Peter Lampman and Adam Stull; praying for arrears of Pension, for services during the war of 1812.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kent, praying that immediate steps may be taken for the disposal of all Crown, Clergy, and School Lands yet remaining

within the County of Kent; and also, that certain Marsh Lands may be sold in blocks, subject to conditions of drainage and settlement.

Of Charles Robertson and others, Members of the Board of United Separate School Trustees for the City of Toronto; praying for certain amendments to the Separate School Act.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Northumberland and Durham; praying that the fifth section of the Clergy Reserve Act may be so amended that the portion of the Clergy Reserves to which the said United Counties may become entitled, be divided among the several Municipalities constituting the said United Counties, in proportion to population.

Of the Corporation of the College of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière; praying for aid.

Of Joseph Smith Lee, of the City of Ottawa; stating that he was Lessee of the building occupied by the Legislature, and was deprived of the same, and praying compensation.

Of the Milton Mechanics' Institute and Library Association; praying for aid.

On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

And the Order of the day being read, for resuming the adjourned Debate upon the Amendment which was yesterday proposed to be made to the third paragraph of the Question, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General to thank His Excellency for His Gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it Elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of

(36)

civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since their last meeting nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing a Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency

*in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:*

*That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and*

(37)

*the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:*

*That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs' Duties which were made by Parliament last year:*

*That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:*

*That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:*

*That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic, we have however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:*

*That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:*

*That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event;*

*And which Amendment was, That the words "this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves," be left out of the said paragraph, and the words "it would have afforded this House sincere gratification had we been enabled to congratulate His Excellency on the final and equitable settlement of the long disputed question of the Clergy Reserves; but it is our duty to state that the Act of last Session has not effected the avowed object for which it was framed, but, on the contrary, has permanently endowed certain favored Churches with large sums of public money," inserted instead thereof;*

*And the Question on the Amendment being again proposed; the House resumed the said adjourned debate.*

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB having moved the orders of the day,<sup>1</sup>

MR. RANKIN, rose and said that when the House adjourned last evening one of the clauses of the Address was under consideration. It was usual on occasions of the kind both here and in the old country to allow members every degree of latitude in the discussion of measures involving the interests of the country. With the intention of exercising that privilege on the present occasion he was desirous of giving some explanation to the House, as to his mode of action and the motives by which he

had been actuated. If he had not mingled himself up with any of the various parties who were in that House, it had arisen from his general inexperience, and a wish, upon entering public life--as it is desirable first, to be well acquainted with the party to whom a member in his position committed himself. This would be admitted to be desirable, so that a member may connect himself to their political tenets with honor to himself as a man, and in accordance with the general views of his constituents. It was further the duty of every public man to acquaint himself thoroughly with all the bearings of every public question which was likely to come up for discussion, and it was also requisite that he should be endowed with some little measure of forethought, and closely to observe what is taking place in other countries which has a bearing upon his own, so as to shape out some course of action upon his own convictions.<sup>2</sup> He had found, up to this period, there were but few men in this House who entertained opinions exactly similar to his own, upon some of the points which he considered of very great importance. Few men would deny that the time must soon arrive when this country would cease to retain its colonial position--(cries of Hear, hear)--when it would attain to a certain degree of importance, which, in the nature of things, must make it an independent country, or a portion of some other confederacy. He trusted that his sentiments upon this would not be misunderstood, as he thought that he had given sufficient proof of his sentiments of loyalty to the Crown, to leave a doubt in the minds of any one as to his true position. He could not shut his eyes to the fact that there was a state of feeling growing up in this country, which would rapidly bring about important changes. In his opinion, it was just as natural for a colony or a community, when they had attained to a certain growth, to seek the establishment for themselves of a national reputation,<sup>3</sup> precisely in the same way as a young man, just entering upon life, takes that course for independence which his father had done before him. It [is] useless to argue that his father had provided for him, for he has the natural wish to provide for himself--his father before him has established a reputation for himself, and his own ambition leads him to do the same for himself. Those colonies who had so established an empire for themselves reflected great credit upon the mother country from which they had descended.<sup>4</sup> Nothing could be further from his feelings than rashly to bring about a separation between this colony and Great Britain. No man would be more ready to shoulder his musket than he would to resist any such attempt. He firmly believed that such a change would take place in the natural course of events, and the day was not so far distant as some might think. He thought it would become gentlemen who were leaders to adopt a line of policy which would recognise the possibility of such a change, and would bring it out in a manner that would reflect credit upon all parties and meet the approbation of the mother country. He believed that Canada would eventually become an independent nation or<sup>5</sup> be joined to the United States.<sup>6</sup> Nothing would be more disagreeable to him than to suppose that he would ever live to find himself what they called a "Yankee." (Laughter.) In saying this he was not animated by any illiberality towards that people, but he did not admire their institutions, and he disliked exceedingly their manners and habits. He admitted there was much that was reasonable in their constitution and to be admired in their form of government.<sup>7</sup> There was no way in which they could avert becoming a part of that republic, than by bringing about a confederation of all the British North American Provinces, and to strengthen themselves in such a way as to become, at no distant day, an independent nation. It was because these were his views, that he had not felt justified in identifying himself with any of the parties in this House, and he should endeavour to preserve the position of an independent member--ever ready to give a hearty support to those measures which he considered worthy of his support; but determined to oppose that which he felt to have a pernicious tendency--no matter where it

emanated. He had listened to the speeches made on both sides of the House, and he felt that those on his side were remarkable for nothing but their hostility to the existing Government. It was clear to him that they had no policy to submit, but that of denouncing the present Government.<sup>8</sup> If they could succeed in upsetting the government, were they prepared to build up a government which would command the confidence of the country? (Cries of hear, hear.) The opinions of the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Brown) were peculiar to himself, but he was a leader without followers, and he doubted very much whether he (Mr. B.) could rally three gentlemen upon this floor who were prepared to adopt him as a recognized leader.<sup>9</sup> In reference to the Address, he said he had but few remarks to make it appeared to him to be a very lame affair. It was quite evident that all the assertions it did contain were true, and did not require to be bolstered up by argument. It seemed to be one of the forms necessary to be gone through, and he thought it would have been more patriotic had the gentlemen on his side of the House allowed that form to be gone through with as little delay as possible, in order that they might have proceeded to the business of the country.<sup>10</sup> He was prepared to support the Police Bill, and<sup>11</sup> in regard to the Clergy Reserves Bill, although he was opposed to the commutation clause of that bill, he did not feel himself called upon by any regard for consistency now to follow the lead of the gentleman from Lambton (Mr. B.) After making some further explanations of his views upon this matter Mr. R. concluded by saying that he believed the intentions of the present Government were decidedly patriotic<sup>12</sup>. Their experience as politicians could not be deceived nor could it be denied that the country had derived much advantage from their administration.<sup>13</sup> To many of the members of the government, the country had at different times been much indebted, especially to the hon. and gallant member for Hamilton; also to the present Solicitor General, who was the first gentleman who ever held that office who went round the circuit and attended to its duties, and no one could deny that the hon. Inspector General had been always distinguished for the purity of his conduct as a public man.<sup>14</sup>

A message was here received from the Legislative Council stating that that hon. House had named a committee to confer with a committee from the Lower House in regard to the location of the library.<sup>15</sup>

(37)

*A Message from the Legislative Council, by John Fennings Taylor, Esquire, one of the Masters in Chancery:--*

*Mr. Speaker,*

*The Legislative Council acquaint this House, that they have appointed a Select Committee, composed of the Honorable Messieurs DeBlaquière, Fergusson, Moore and Taché, to assist His Honor the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of their House are concerned, and to act on behalf of their House, as Members of a Joint Committee of both Houses.*

*And then he withdrew.*

*And the Question being again proposed on the Amendment, which was yesterday proposed to be made to the third paragraph of the Question, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his*

(38)

*gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:*

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since their last meeting nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts, by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labors in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid

(39)

before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing a Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs Duties which were made by Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic, we have however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:

That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:

*That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honourable peace, Canada will*

(40)

*rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event;*

*And a further Debate arising thereupon;*

MR. RANKIN resumed and briefly referred to some of the points of the speech of the hon. member for Lambton, and concluded by expressing his confidence in the present government<sup>16</sup>, to give them his support as far as in him lay. (Cries of hear, hear.)<sup>17</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--The question before the house, as he understood it, was upon the amendment of the honorable member for Lambton, and that gentleman had doubtless selected for his amendment the resolution in the address relating to the Clergy Reserves, as embracing that subject which he had always brought most prominently before the public both in the house and out of the house. It might, however, have been imagined that the honorable member would now have allowed this to drop, or at least that he, knowing better than any member of the house what the true state of the case was, having examined all the accounts, and having had every opportunity of gaining information, would have taken care to bring forward a true statement, and not one calculated to deceive the people of this country. The honorable member had every opportunity (*sic*) for obtaining information connected with the carrying out of this bill, and he was prepared to stand up here and not only attack one body after another, first the Church of England and then the Church of Scotland, but actually to place him in the position of contending that those churches had been commuted with, when he knew that the commutation had been made with the Clergy as individuals, and not with the church as a body.<sup>18</sup>

MR. BROWN.--No, no.<sup>19</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--He judged from the Globe newspaper; but when it suited the purpose of the hon. gentleman, he was always ready to disclaim anything that appeared in the Globe, and when it suited him to acknowledge what appeared there, he would do so.--If the hon. gentleman had gone into an examination of what had occurred, or were desirous of giving to the house the real facts of the case, he would have been able to say that the commutation was not effected with the churches but with individuals, and he could not help saying, what every one must acknowledge, that those clergymen who had put the money they received to the credit of their churches were entitled to all honor and all praise for their conduct in so doing. (Hear, hear). The hon. member had always taken the opportunity of setting forth how important it was that the agitation on the subject of the Clergy Reserves should be put an end to, and how desirous he was of bringing it to a close; and now when that had been done, with the consent of the whole house, he said that a large body of the people of this country were against the settlement of the Clergy Reserves in the manner in which it had been carried out. It was not for the hon. member to say that commutation had been made with the Churches and not with the clergy.--Every clergyman had the right to have said that he would take his money and apply it as he pleased; and yet there was not a single clergyman, whether of the Church of England or the Church of Scotland, who had placed himself in that position. The application of this money to

the uses of the church could no more be called vesting money by the State, than it could be called the act of the State, if any member of the House had chosen to place at the disposal of any other person the money which he set apart for the purposes of his church. This fact had taken away the right of the hon. member to make these charges against the clergy, whether they were of the Church of England or of the Church of Scotland, or against the government for having allowed that commutation to be made. The hon. gentleman had attacked the clergy of the church of Scotland, and said that their conduct in the matter was a piece of fraud: but what were the facts of the case? Was it not known that a portion of their salaries had always been set apart to form a fund for the building of manses and the support of the widows and orphans, and this did not appear in the statements of their salaries. Then in 1853, they divided the surplus, among themselves. This constituted the whole difficulty. It was just as if any number of persons should, out of a yearly income of 1000L, agree to set apart the sum of 200L, and then at some particular time divide the sum thus saved among themselves when the means from which it was derived were about to come to an end.<sup>20</sup> The means for the accumulation of this fund had been cut off by the Legislature, and they divided the money which justly belonged to them, and commuted upon the sum they were actually entitled to from the Resreve (sic) Fund, and in consequence of this a charge of corruption has been raised.<sup>21</sup> Was this made a matter of reproach to the Government or to those who made this arrangement? Were they to be charged with fraud on such grounds as those? If it was right for one body of men to be charged with fraud on such grounds, it was equally right to charge all. But when the documents came down, it would be seen how far there was any foundation for these charges. The hon. member for Lambton had threatened the country with a dissolution of the Union. He said to the people of Lower Canada, that if they did not adopt his course the Union should be dissolved, but he (Mr. Cameron) said such was not the case in Upper Canada, they were strongly in favor of the Union continuing. Their feeling was that the continuance of the Union was the best means of preserving that position as a country whose people, sprung from a union of many different races, which they had already attained to. They had taken a high position already as a united colony, and they would keep that position already as a united colony, and they would keep that position better by not being separated from each other. They had gained a name all over Europe, and it was because their united legislation had placed before them the means of displaying before the world the productions of the country. Was this union to be preserved by fostering to the greatest possible extent the seeds of religious discord? Were they to tell the people of Lower Canada, that if they did not hold their views, and give up all their religious institutions, and place themselves in an entirely different position to what they have always occupied, they would not hold union with them even for an hour? Were they prepared to say to the people of Lower Canada, that if they did not at once conform to their views they would cut the connecting ties? No! they were not prepared to say that, and the hon. member for Lambton knew well that they were not, and that there were many on his own side of the house who would not carry out his views, and the hon. member for Montreal had repudiated them before the house, and administered a rebuke to the hon. member for Lambton, for the expressions that he had cast upon the ministers of his religion. With regard to ecclesiastical institutions, they must, if they desire to preserve the union, give up something to Lower Canada<sup>22</sup> [OR] if the people of Lower Canada desired to preserve the union, they must yield something to the feelings of the people of Upper Canada<sup>23</sup>; there must be on both sides a determination to bear and forbear. Many feel with the hon. member for Lambton, on the question of separate Schools, and believe that the view which he takes is the correct one.--That in the national system there is no necessity for religion as forming a part of school education, but that it should be

left for home instruction and the Sunday school. He (Mr. Cameron,) on the other hand, as a member of the Church of England, believed that religion and education should go together hand in hand, but when he said that, he was not prepared to tell those who thought differently that he would sever all connection with them. He did not think it right to cram his opinions down the throats of those who with equally honest convictions held different opinions.--They had been told that there was a plan to change the position of the Common School. They had seen communications, and heard letters showing an intention existing among some parties to place the Separate School system on a different footing--on the basis of population. He hoped that such an attempt would not be made, because it would be a most injurious measure, and because the members from Upper Canada would vote against it, and it would meet with violent opposition from both sides of the house; and he thought the Government were prepared to resist such a step. He hoped that the measure for the general constitution of religious and charitable institutions which was promised in the speech, would place them all upon such a footing that the scenes which they had seen in that house would be evaded; and that these institutions would be so constituted that they could hold no land but what was necessary for their own purposes; and also, that no dying bequests should be allowed but what had been made six months before the death of the testator. He felt perfectly convinced that when they looked on this side of the house, and on that side of the house, and when they knew the views of honorable members from different parts of the country, it would be evident that [if] they turned out the present ministers<sup>24</sup> they could not find their successors. (Hear, hear.)<sup>25</sup> The principle of representation by population he considered right in the abstract, and he had voted for it, and would do so again, but were the members of the opposition united on that or any other question?--The hon. member for Lambton said that he was a governmental impossibility, and that he could never look to carrying out his principles in the government of the country, could he then undertake the responsibility of Government? Were the Conservatives as a body, or the Reform party as a body, prepared to take the government of the country? If they were to dissolve the house at the present moment, could there be men elected out of either of these parties that could carry on the government. In the opposition, as at present constituted, there was no principle in common; they were at issue on the principle of representation by population, on the separate school question, and on the Legislative Council bill. How could the member for Lambton sit at the Council Board with the member for Montreal on the separate school bill? or with the member for Glengary on the representation question? The hon. member for Lambton taunted the Government with want of cohesion, but did the hon. gentleman show that there is any cohesion of principle between himself and the other members of the opposition? How could the house expect that among gentlemen professing such widely diverging views, there could be discovered that unity of purpose necessary for the formation of a Government? Did they themselves expect to find one principle on which they could unite in the formation of an administration? There was no doubt questions on which individuals among them would probably find a large portion of the people of Upper Canada ready to unite with them; but though that is the case, the people do not rely so implicitly in their antecedents as to feel that it would be safe to entrust them with the administration of the affairs of this country. Though he might himself believe, with the honorable member for Lambton that the principle of representation by population is correct in the abstract, and must one day be carried into effect, was it to be supposed on that account, that he could accord with the honorable gentleman, when they differ so widely, when they differ so thoroughly, in their views as to legislation on Church matters, and on all those important questions, which may arise out of their consideration.--There is then, a want of cohesion among the members of the opposition on great and important principles--

there is existing among them that very lack of some one definite course of action, on which they can cohere, which they charge on the Government as a serious evil; and which they take as a ground for calling on the people of Upper Canada to withdraw from the Government their support. But though this is the case, though these differences undoubtedly do exist in the administration, though some members of the opposition advance theoretical opinions in which he concurs, though the ministry is charged with now advocating principles which they formerly opposed, he felt that he could not withdraw his support from the administration, in order to place gentlemen opposite on the Treasury Benches, as their antecedents would not warrant him in yielding them his confidence. It may be true, as honorable gentlemen opposite allege, that the members of the Ministry are chargeable with having changed the views that they held formerly; but there is this to be said for them as an administration--that they come down to this house united, acting harmoniously together, holding the same views, and those views so fully met the approbation of this house, that they are supported by a majority of two to one on every question they have submitted. And when this is the case, it is unreasonable to expect that he, and gentlemen holding his views, should unite with the hon. member for Lambton, the hon. member for Glengary, and the hon. member for Montreal, to turn them out, and put those hon. gentlemen in their places! He would ask the hon. member for Lambton what ground he could advance for expecting their support? What reason he had for supposing that he or any other member of the Opposition could succeed in forming a united and harmonious Cabinet, when the hon. gentlemen had been compelled to admit that the Opposition is frittered to fragments on all the questions which have recently formed subjects of agitation, and that the platform he had erected is so rotten that it falls into atoms the moment the hon. member for Glengarry puts his foot on it! That is the very reverse of the position of the Government, and there can be no doubt that as long as the Government are prepared to offer for the consideration of the House those measures which the house and the country have a right to expect at their hands, so long as the Government are prepared to express views in accordance with those that have given them this large and united support, so long would they receive the support of the house, so long at least should they receive his support. There is no doubt that the Government is prepared to bring down those measures. The house had not seen them; but the members of the Government said they were prepared, and should be submitted at the proper time--and if they should prove to be the case, if they are brought down, and their details are worked out fairly and honestly, then he imagined that those measures would receive that support from the house to which they would be fairly entitled. The member for Lambton should understand, that although he (Mr. C.) and his friends could not approve indiscriminately of every past act of the administration, still they are not going to assist in turning that administration out, when they do not see any ready to take their places. They will be judged by their acts, and their measures will receive the support or the opposition which they merit at his hands. He would remind that hon. gentleman that he had said the subject of religion was too sacred for legislation; that it ought to be excluded from consideration in these halls altogether; that he was desirous of all religious (sic) bodies being reduced to the voluntary system. Now he differed from that view, he could not believe that the most sacred subject is one too good for legislation. He could not conceive that when there was no attempt to coerce men's individual opinions by legislative means, that when he and his co-religionists came here asking for the same freedom of action in religious matters which the hon. gentleman claimed for himself, he could not conceive, he said, that under such circumstances he should be met on the very threshold by the hon. member for Lambton with the assertion that such measures were too sacred for legislation. The hon. member, as well as many others in this country, were very much in the habit

of charging bigotry upon the Roman Catholics, but when he (Mr. Cameron) came here asking that his church might be freed from the trammels by which it is bound, and from which every other church in the Province is free, he found that resistance came from professed liberals, (hear, hear.) The men of broad Protestant principles, (hear, hear.) And that he received assistance and support from those very bigoted Roman Catholics,<sup>26--</sup>

Ministerial cheers<sup>27</sup>.

[MR. CAMERON:] ... whose reputed intolerance is held up as an object of calumny and reproach. (Renewed cheering.) That was the practical distinction that he discovered between the Roman Catholic members of the House, and the broad Protestant principles of the member for Lambton. That hon. gentleman at one moment announced the severance of Church and State, stated assuredly that the last connecting link had been severed, and yet when others came to that House to claim the same liberty of conscience, the same freedom in religious matters, which he demanded for himself, they were told by him that the subject was altogether too sacred, or taunted them with seeking to stand in the position of a favored church.<sup>28</sup>

MR. BROWN.--How did the members of the Government vote? How did the Attorney General West vote?<sup>29</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--I do not know how the Attorney General voted. I do not think he voted at all.<sup>30</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Hear! hear!<sup>31</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--Does that make any difference? Does the hon. gentleman pin his faith to the Attorney General West?<sup>32</sup>

MR. BROWN.--By no means.<sup>33</sup>

MR. CAMERON proceeded to say that he remembered the time when some of that party who now formed the opposition, passed a law that any Protestant clergyman who dared to go to an election and vote, should be fined 100L, and the same party passed a law binding down the Orangemen of the country, and preventing party processions.<sup>34</sup> Is it not true that these professing liberals were the same who passed two stringent and illiberal statutes which would have disgraced a semi-civilized age? And yet did the hon. gentleman expect his support?<sup>35</sup>

A gentleman near him said that those laws were passed by the Lower Canadians.<sup>36</sup>

[MR. CAMERON] replied, that he did not care what the Lower Canadians had to do with it. If the Lower Canadians had anything to do with passing those acts, they were merely acting in perfect accordance with those principles which they always conscientiously maintained; but it was in reality to propitiate them, and to obtain their alliance, that those acts were passed by men who negatived the whole of their principles for the purpose. On the school system he again differed from the member for Lambton. That honorable gentleman thought the secular system was quite sufficient. He (Mr. C.) entertained a different view. He thought that when a youth is being trained up at his school in secular knowledge, a reference by his teacher to the great first cause should be admitted without the supposition that it could give offence to any professing Christian tenets. He would say that there are subjects on

which all might unite, and that, if the member for Lambton would bring in some general system for that purpose he would act far more patriotically, and far more like a statesman than in always declaiming, and limiting himself merely to declamation, against any and every motion preceeding from the other side of the house. The hon. gentleman was always complaining of the evils of the system, but what has he himself offered for the purpose of removing them, and introducing a general system. Impotent for devising any system for good, the hon. gentleman is solely determined on attack. Instead of devising some general scheme on which all could unite, he limits himself to a series of assaults on every measure proposed; and yet he (Mr. C.) believed that some general scheme might be introduced on which all could agree. He and his co-religionists of the Church of England are prepared to abandon every claim to exclusive rights, they are prepared to adopt a national system of education, but they desire to see that system based on religion. They believed that there are some forms of prayer, some doctrines, in which all Christians can agree. They believed that the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed<sup>37</sup>, and the ten commandments, and the doctrines of atonement, and of resurrection and of grace<sup>38</sup> belong equally to all, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic; and that they might with propriety be taught the children without offending the religious prejudices of any. That was what they wished to see incorporated in the system of instruction to youth at the common schools, and what he believed would tend more to the elevation of the youth of this country than any system of merely secular education. There was only one other question to which he would refer—he meant the Police Force, alluded to in the speech from the throne, and which he believed to be necessary from the fact that the constabulary has frequently proved inefficient in suppressing riots, that the military has consequently been called out, and that the ordinary militia force of the ... country was seldom to be depended on for that service, from the unwillingness evinced by the people to act as policemen, and from the necessity of having such a force in existence as could be depended on for the prompt and effectual suppression of riots, and for the purpose of removing from the nominal control of the municipalities the organization of a force, which in reality dictated to those bodies of which they were to be paid officers.<sup>39</sup>

MR. LORANGER addressed the house in the French language.<sup>40</sup> M. l'Orateur, lorsque, au commencement de la dernière session, j'acceptais la tâche de présenter les résolutions en réponse au discours du trône, je déclarai hautement que j'acceptais la coalition comme une nécessité politique, que dans l'état où se trouvaient les partis, elle était le seul gouvernement possible, et les événements ont donné raison à cette déclaration.

N'eussions-nous, en effet, ni l'expérience du passé, ni les fausses manoeuvres de l'opposition et les hontes du présent, l'honorable membre pour la cité de Montréal, en avouant, hier soir, que l'opposition n'a pas de chef, et que, par conséquent, elle est incapable de marcher avec ensemble, de s'accorder sur aucun principe et de proposer aucune grande mesure, l'honorable membre, dis-je, nous a prouvé que lui et les siens n'étaient point à la hauteur de ceux qu'ils attaquent; il s'est donné, en un mot, à lui-même et à tous ses amis, un brevet d'incapacité administrative.

Dans tout gouvernement constitutionnel, il faut une opposition, mais à la condition que cette opposition pourra, au besoin, gouverner en place du parti qu'elle combat. Telle est la pratique en Angleterre; telles ont été les choses en France, pendant la durée, dans ce pays, du vrai gouvernement représentatif. Telle a été l'opposition dans tous les pays et dans tous les temps. Avant d'essayer de renverser un gouvernement, elle s'est assurée qu'elle saurait gouverner à son tour; car il ne suffit pas de démolir, il faut savoir ériger aussi au milieu des ruines que l'on a faites. (Applaudissements prolongés).

En face de cette nécessité de savoir construire, est-ce que l'honorable membre pour la cité de Montréal et son voisin, l'honorable membre pour Lambton, n'ont pas donné la mesure de leur incapacité? Oui, je ne crains pas de le dire à la face de l'opposition: elle a reconnu son incapacité; et, à l'heure qu'il est, le Canada qui, dans sa jeunesse, marche à grands pas vers la civilisation, notre pays qui se montre plus grand de jour en jour, peut-il se passer du gouvernement qui le guide dans la carrière, du seul qui puisse le diriger, puisque l'opposition a humblement reconnu son incapacité à remplir cette tâche?

Le représentant de Lambton qui semble s'attacher à marcher seul dans son sentier politique, qui s'assied quand les autres se lèvent et qui se lève quand les autres s'assey[e]nt, pourquoi est-il donc seul? c'est parce qu'il n'entend pas la liberté; (bruyants applaudissements,) c'est parce que tout en jetant toujours à ceux qu'il envie ce grand mot d'intolérance, c'est l'intolérance qu'il prêche lui-même; c'est lui qui est le fanatique; ce sont ses idées qui sont exclusives; c'est lui et lui seul ici qui se pose en tyran!

Comme représentant du Bas-Canada, je crois me faire l'écho de toute la représentation de la partie française, en déclarant que ce que nous demandons, ce ne sont ni des privilèges déraisonnables, ni la supériorité dans les conseils de la nation, ni une part plus grande, la part du lion, dans la distribution des deniers publics, ni enfin des droits qui porteraient atteinte aux libertés du Haut-Canada. Ce que nous demandons, c'est l'égalité des deux parties de la province; ce que nous demandons, c'est la liberté chez nous et pour nous; c'est le droit de rester fidèles à notre culte, au génie de notre civilisation, et d'obéir aux instincts de notre race. Voilà ce que nous demandons, et la partie saine de la représentation du Haut-Canada nous rendra justice.

J'ai été affligé, M. l'Orateur, d'entendre l'honorable membre pour la cité de Montréal, en proposant son amendement aux résolutions de l'adresse, s'étendre avec tant de complaisance sur ce qu'il appelle le triste état des écoles dans le Bas-Canada et proclamer la supériorité du Haut-Canada sous ce rapport.<sup>41</sup>

Cris répétés de hear, hear, écoutez, écoutez, partant des rangs de la gauche.<sup>42</sup>

MR. LORANGER.--Les députés du côté opposé de la Chambre se plaisent à m'interrompre en criant de m'écouter. Oui, qu'ils écoutent; mais malheureusement pour eux, nous les avons entendus, et ce n'a pas été à leur avantage. Oui, le membre pour la cité de Montréal a dit que notre système d'éducation, que nos progrès ne peuvent se comparer à ceux du Haut-Canada; mais j'espère qu'en faisant cette assertion, il s'est trompé, ou, que s'il savait ce qu'il disait, il a voulu nous tromper.<sup>43</sup>

Rumeurs à gauche.<sup>44</sup>

[MR. LORANGER:] Et d'ailleurs, en admettant pour un instant cette infériorité de nos écoles et, par conséquent, de notre peuple, est-ce à nous de la proclamer, à nous de nous accuser? à nous de nous humilier? Aussi voyez, M. l'Orateur, comme conclusion directe des assertions de l'hon. membre pour Montréal, le représentant de Lambton a osé nous dire, le lendemain, que là où le prêtre a le contrôle de l'éducation, le peuple est plongé dans l'ignorance. Ce sont ces paroles aussi insolentes qu'injustes qui ont excité, à son tour, le membre pour Montréal à déclarer ensuite que le parti démocrate du Bas-Canada ne fait plus cause commune avec le clear-grits du Haut et que l'opposition (sic) n'a plus de chef. Ce dernier a compris qu'il voyait sous de fausses couleurs et que la société d'un ennemi aussi audacieux du catholicisme lui serait nuisible dans son pays, et lui, un des membres les plus avancé de l'opposition, lui qui se trouve assi[s], entre le foudre du Globe, et le

membre pour Haldimand (M. MacKenzie) s'est vu forcé de faire l'éloge des services rendus par le clergé à la cause de l'enseignement.

Et qu'était-il besoin d'une pareille défense? Si l'hon. membre pour Lambton s'était donné la peine d'étudier l'histoire, il y aurait vu le démenti le plus complet de son audacieuse assertion; il aurait vu les clercs au milieu de la barbarie, pâlir sur les trésors littéraires et scientifiques légués par l'antiquité à la jeune civilisation européenne, fouiller patiemment et avec intelligence les ruines faites de tous côtés par les hordes barbares, pour en retirer quelques débris de la sagesse grecque, de l'expérience latine. Les moines, qu'entre tous les soldats de l'Eglise, ses ennemis se sont tant plu à ridiculiser, déchiffraient les plus obscurs in-folios, enfantaient eux-mêmes les plus volumineux ouvrages, et là où ils n'avaient trouvé qu'ignorance, superstition, cruauté et grossièreté, parvenaient à faire renaître les lettres, à créer une magnifique civilisation. Voilà ce que nul homme d'étude ne voudra et ne pourra contester. Et tandis que la civilisation marche, oserait-on dire que le clergé se croise les bras et reste stationnaire, la regardant passer! Il marche lui aussi avec nous; aujourd'hui, comme alors, il nous guide, il est à la hauteur du siècle, et quoiqu'en dise l'hon. représentant de Lambton, plaise à Dieu qu'il n'y ait dans son comté d'autres ignorants que ceux dont les prêtres ont fait l'éducation! (applaud. et rires!)

Le député de Montréal, dans le discours d'adieu qu'il a prononcé en quittant le député de Lambton, a cité la Belgique comme preuve de l'excellence de l'instruction religieuse, et il a eu raison; mais ce n'est pas tout; ce n'est pas seulement dans ce petit coin de terre que le clergé s'est montré grand et capable de gouverner. Qu'était la France d'autrefois? qui l'a prise à son berceau pour l'instruire? n'est-ce pas le clergé? Qui a fondé ces collèges d'où de splendides lumières ont jailli pour é[c]lairer le monde entier? Qui a créé ces institutions de charité qui sont le chef-d'oeuvre de la civilisation? qui a protégé les premiers essais de l'industrie? qui a fait faire les premiers pas à la science? n'est-ce pas toujours et en tout le clergé que nous trouvons en avant, bien avant des nations et les excitant à le suivre vers la lumière? La grande éducation du Bas-Canada est cléricale, et je défie l'hon. membre pour Lambton de choisir parmi les écoles qu'il admire et d'en trouver une supérieure à celles que dirigent les prêtres, de présenter les élèves sortis des écoles qu'il vante et de prouvé (sic) leur supériorité sur ceux dont les prêtres ont pétri l'intelligence.

Je reviens à l'amendement. Il est dit quelque part que le fou voit une paille dans l'oeil du sage, mais qu'il n'aperçoit pas une poutre dans le sien. L'opposition s'est chargée de donner raison à ce proverbe. Elle reproche à l'administration d'avoir parlé en termes généraux des mesures que celle-ci propose. Ce langage concis ne lui plaisait pas; il n'était pas assez explicite, dit-elle, et voilà pourquoi elle proposa à son tour un amendement. Or, que dit cet amendement de plus précis que le discours du trône? que nous apprend-il? Peut-on rien lire de plus vague et de plus incertain?

(M. Loranger lit le paragraphe du discours du trône relatif à l'éducation et l'amendement proposé par M. Dorion.)

Vous voyez, M. l'Orateur qu'il ne se trouve pas dans cet amendement une seule mesure que l'on reproche au ministère de n'avoir pas annoncée, une seule phrase plus claire, promettant davantage que le paragraphe correspondant dans le discours du trône.

Et d'ailleurs, est-ce un reproche à faire au gouvernement d'avoir été laconique dans le discours d'ouverture? N'est-ce pas l'usage dans tous les pays constitutionnels, de faire dire à ces discours le moins possible? Est-ce un crime de ne pas les convertir en catalogues de toutes les mesures que la Chambre passera en revue pendant la session? Pour ne citer que l'Angleterre, j'ai pris la peine de compulser les

journaux des Communes de ce pays, et j'ai trouvé qu'en 1849, par exemple, le discours du trône ne mentionna qu'une seule mesure à introduire, et pourtant le parlement passa dans la session de cette année, 100 lois sur les plus graves questions. Trois mesures seulement furent annoncées en 1850, deux en 1851, le même nombre en 1852, et une seule en 1853. L'émancipation catholique en Irlande ne fut que l'objet d'une mention passagère lors de l'ouverture de la session de 1829, et nos actes constitutionnels de 1791 et de 1840 attirèrent à peine l'attention des discours du trône.

Je crois que ces exemples, puisés dans l'histoire parlementaire de l'Angleterre, sont suffisants pour prouver que la pratique est invariablement suivie de ne faire dans le discours du trône, tout au plus, qu'une mention passagère des grandes mesures que le parlement aura à considérer.

Est-ce donc avec bonne grâce que l'opposition a fait à l'administration le reproche d'avoir été trop concise? Était-il de bonne guerre de faire sonner si haut ses regrets pour ce qu'elle nomme l'oubli ou plutôt la négligence du gouvernement, tandis qu'elle garde elle-même le silence sur les mesures qu'elle a préparées, sur les principes qu'elle soutient? Qu'elle répare donc la faute du gouvernement puisqu'elle s'érige en censeur; qu'elle donne l'exemple; qu'elle nous dise ce qu'elle veut, ce qu'elle espère. Si elle tient en réserve quelque heureux plan qui doit grandir le pays, pourquoi ne se hâte-t-elle pas? il ne saurait être trop tôt.

La loi sur l'éducation fonctionne bien dans le Haut-Canada. C'est l'opposition qui nous l'assure. Il existe donc une loi et cette loi est bonne; elle est aussi bonne dans le Bas-Canada que dans le Haut. C'est encore un aveu fait par l'hon. représentant de Montréal.<sup>45</sup>

MR. A. DORION se lève et prétend ne pas avoir tenu ce langage.<sup>46</sup>

[MR. LORANGER:] Par courtoisie, je ne désire pas affirmer un fait que l'honorable député nie, mais il faut que ma mémoire me trompe grandement s'il n'a pas fait cet aveu. L'hon. membre a dit que les places d'inspecteurs pour l'enseignement étaient simplement des moyens de patronage; et ensuite, il nous a assuré que ces inspecteurs avaient présenté d'excellents rapports qu'il reproche au gouvernement de ne pas avoir pris en assez sérieuse considération. Ces inspecteurs n'étaient donc pas des fonctionnaires incapables, arrivés seulement par la protection? Pourquoi l'hon. député reconnaît qu'ils ont fait leur devoir?

L'opposition a cru se faire une arme terrible contre le gouvernement en lui reprochant de n'avoir pas encore organisé une seule école normale dans le Bas-Canada. N'avons-nous pas les collèges qui en tiennent lieu? et l'hon. membre pour la cité de Montréal, que par, extraordinaire, l'on a entendu faire un si pompeux éloge du clergé, pour se protéger, sans doute, contre le mépris qui tombera sur l'opposition dès que le Bas-Canada apprendra les paroles injurieuses de son ex-associé, le représentant de Lambton, le membre pour Montréal, dis-je, n'accepte-t-il pas ces collèges? ne les croit-il pas suffisants? n'ont-ils pas répondu jusqu'à présent aux besoins du jour? Ah! l'opposition, si dénuée de principes, si pauvre de mesures, se verra toujours poursuivie par les colères des Canadiens-Français de la droite qui lui reprocheront d'avoir mis inutilement leur pays dans une position humiliante aux yeux de l'étranger. (Applaudissements.) Ce fait seul rendrait son triomphe impossible. Mais elle n'aurait pas pu triompher, même sans cela! L'opposition qui a un principe, qui, armée d'une conviction, s'en sert pour frapper et frapper encore le gouvernement, finit, comme la goutte d'eau qui tombe sans cesse, par percer et arriver. Mais quand une opposition n'a point de principes; quand elle n'a point de liens, point de bannière, point de chef, nul guide, nul panache à suivre, nul mot d'ordre pour se rallier, alors elle se démembre. Et c'est là,

M. l'Orateur, l'opposition qui se groupe à votre gauche. Elle n'a pas de chef; ils sont trente de ce côté, et ils sont tous chefs. Ce sont des généraux sans soldats, un corps sans tête et sans queue, ou plutôt le monstre d'Horace, ayant la tête d'un cheval et la queue (sic) d'un poisson.

Avez-vous jamais entendu parler, M. l'Orateur, d'un vrai parti sans chef? vous en voyez un à votre gauche. Celui que l'on a désigné jusqu'à présent comme le chef de la bande, vient de donner sa démission. Et il a eu raison de se démettre de son commandement, car sa campagne parlementaire de la dernière session, campagne qui n'a été qu'un tissu des fautes les plus ridicules, a démenti son inexpérience et son incapacité.<sup>47</sup>

Une voix de la gauche.--Nous sommes tous chef[s].<sup>48</sup>

MR. LORANGER.--Vous voyez que j'ai raison, puisqu'eux-mêmes le renient. C'est pourtant lui qui, mercredi, me conseillait d'aller dans le comté que j'ai l'honneur de représenter et d'apprendre ce qu'on m'y préparait. Qu'il se rende lui-même parmi les électeurs qu'il (sic) l'ont choisi; car, à bon droit, je puis lui dire: "Pleurez sur vous, Jérusalem!"

D'où viennent toutes les rancunes de l'opposition? n'est-ce pas parce qu'elle a sur le coeur la coalition? ne sait-on pas que ce fut là la vraie source de sa tactique de la session dernière et ne pouvons-nous pas prévoir que l'histoire du passé va devenir l'histoire du présent? C'est en vain que nous leur avons dit que le pays avait accepté la coalition comme nécessité politique justifiée par la division des partis, l'abandon des principes, et la reconnaissance des doctrines libérales; en nous croyant, ils ont fait semblant de rester incrédules. Mais le pays n'avait-il pas raison de préférer la certitude que lui apporte le gouvernement à l'incertitude que lui réservait l'opposition? Aujourd'hui, le jour s'est fait: nous trouvons cette dernière sans principes, par conséquent, incapable de gouverner. Cependant il faut un gouvernement; les membres les plus avancés de la gauche ne le nieront pas; or, où le pays irait-il chercher ce gouvernement, s'il venait à perdre celui qu'il a?

Je n'ai jamais été partisan enthousiaste de la coalition que je préfère cependant au dévergondage de l'opposition ultra-démocratique, car en vérité qu'a-t-elle fait depuis la dernière session? Où en est-elle aujourd'hui? Quels progrès a-t-elle fait? Au lieu d'avancer n'a-t-elle pas rétrogardé (sic)? Qu'a-t-elle fait de sa mesure favorite du choix du gouverneur par l'élection? qu'a-t-elle fait du principe de l'élection des juges? des parlemens annuels? du suffrage universel? de tous les articles enfin de ce long programme qui paraissait flamboyant dans les colonnes de l'Avenir?

Si l'opposition y avait réellement tenu, il y avait pour elle un moyen de faire une profession de foi politique en proposant les mesures en amendement à la réforme au discours du trône. Sur le terrain des mesures qu'elle aurait proposées, la discussion se serait engagée et au moins la lumière aurait fini par jaillir d'un côté ou de l'autre, au profit du pays.

Mais l'opposition ne combat pour aucun principe; c'est pour le triomphe de quelques ambitions personnelles qu'elle a déclaré la guerre. Elle fait la guerre à certaines individualités et non à leur politique, et croit-elle mériter sérieusement le nom d'opposition? Ne sait-elle donc pas qu'une opposition qui n'a pour base que la haine de certains hommes, et pour but leur exclusion, ne constitue pas un parti?

Libre à quelques uns de taxer de servilité ceux qui défendent le gouvernement; c'est là un reproche banal que ceux qui aspirent n'épargnent jamais au[x] soutiens du pouvoir tant que ce gouvernement propose de bonnes lois, pourquoi l'honnête homme politique craindrait-il de lui donner sa voix? Quant à moi, j'ai suivi attentivement

la marche du gouvernement actuel, et je le dis hautement à ses amis comme à ses adversaires, je lui promets mon appui tant qu'il suivra le sentier des réformes que le pays réclame; je le lui promets, parce que je le vois animé de bonnes intentions pour le pays, bien que ses ennemis s'efforcent de les dénaturer. En veut-on un exemple? Le voici: le discours du trône renferme une phrase relative à la dépression du commerce des bois. Sur ces mots, le membre pour Montréal se lève et dit que le commerce des bois importe peu à la ville qu'il représente. Il se trompe évidemment, car Montréal est l'entrepôt d'approvisionnement du commerce de bois de l'Ottawa; mais, dans tous les cas, pourquoi ne pas proposer lui-même une mesure commerciale? Est-ce au gouvernement seulement de travailler au bonheur du pays? Puisque l'Exécutif prend part aux travaux législatifs de l'Assemblée, pourquoi les membres de la Chambre ne viendraient-ils pas à leur tour en aide [à] l'Exécutif? L'opposition devrait donc proposer une mesure; mais le pour[r]ait-elle? en a-t-elle à proposer? Si, par hasard (*sic*), (ce qui n'est d'ailleurs qu'une hypothèse improbable) si demain elle parvenait à renverser le gouvernement, produirait-elle les plans superbes qu'elle tient en réserve? S'il en est ainsi, il est fâcheux que l'auteur de l'amendement--j'allais dire le chef de l'opposition, mais rappelons-nous qu'il le fut et qu'il ne l'est plus--il est fâcheux qu'il ait cru devoir priver le pays du secours de ses lumières, le laisser encore marcher à tâtons dans l'obscurité où l'a plongé le gouvernement.

Après la question des écoles et celle du commerce, vient la question de la Tenure Seignuriale. Naturellement elle est aussi l'objet des sarcasmes du membre pour Montréal. Il dit entr'autres choses, qu'en septembre, on avait nommé des juges suppléants, que la cause avait traîné en long[ue]ur et qu'après six longs mois, l'on n'a pas encore donné une solution à des questions aisées à décider. Comment peut-on traiter de faciles des questions devant lesquelles la jurisprudence française se serait arrêtée embarrassée et que les ... juges supérieurs du pays ayant en tête un magistrat dont les connaissances légales ne le cèdent à celles d'aucun jurisconsulte, et dont, sous ce rapport, bien des avocats prétentieux sont à peine dignes de dénouer les souliers, ont trouvées épineuses et dignes des plus graves études? L'associé senior du membre pour Montréal, M. Cherrier, chargé de la défense des seigneurs, a consacré plus d'une année de ses veilles à l'étude des questions que son collègue trouve si faciles à décider. Il a certainement eu tort; car M. Dorion eût plaidé la cause aussi facilement qu'il rédige une exception péremptoire. (rires)

L'hon. membre, voulant à toute force critiquer, blâmer, censurer et combattre, demande ensuite au gouvernement ce qu'il a fait des terrains de l'artillerie. Nous apprendrions, dit-il, avec plaisir, que la Province s'est enrichie de cette propriété.--Vraiment! l'hon. membre apprendrait cela avec plaisir! A-t-il donc oublié déjà que, l'année dernière, lorsque la loi qui devait faire profiter le pays des biens de l'ordonnance fut proposée à la Chambre, il vota contre cette loi, lui et ... je ne dirai pas son parti, (il n'en a plus,) mais ceux qui sont assis autour de lui?

Pour remonter de ces particularités à de plus hautes questions, je dirai, M. l'Orateur, que la question des écoles est, à un certain point, liée à la question religieuse, le Bas-Canada qui a ses moeurs particulières, ses usages et ses instituts religieux auxquels il est attaché comme il l'est à toutes ses institutions, ne veut pas d'éducation commune; on veut des écoles séparées. On croit parmi nous que l'enfant doit puiser, pour ainsi dire, avec le lait, les germes de sa piété, les semences des principes moraux. On se figure, et qui d'assez osé pour nous blâmer? qu'après avoir appris sa première prière sur les genoux de sa mère, l'enfant passant à l'école doit y trouver des paroles en harmonie avec celles qu'il entendait au sein de sa famille, et que ce serait un malheur, si, par un mot, l'instituteur portait

atteinte à l'effet des enseignements matériels. On veut donc des écoles séparées où chaque élève (sic) trouve un maître qui lui parle comme on lui parle à son foyer et les avantages (sic) que le Bas-Canada demande pour lui, il est prêt à les offrir au Haut-Canada. L'école commune n'est pas possible d'ailleurs dans un pays où, à part la différence des religions, les élèves seraient encore classés selon leurs langues respectives. Verrait-on côte à côte deux pédagogues, l'un parlant français et l'autre anglais, instruisant alternativement, celui-ci tel élève et celui-là, tel autre, tous dans la même salle?

Mais j'y reviens: c'est là surtout une question religieuse. Le membre pour Montréal a reproché à son ami d'avoir été sévère envers les prêtres. Ne sait-il donc pas que ce dernier ne se sert de cette question des écoles séparées que comme d'un cheval de bataille, d'un engin de guerre dont il se soucie fort peu au fond du coeur? Dans tous les cas, ils devront voter ensemble sur cette question, car pendant la dernière session, le représentant de Montréal s'est prononcé en faveur des écoles communes, ce qui lui a valu une verte semonce de la part du député d'Iberville. Comment arrive-t-il qu'après avoir fait pendant si longtemps cause commune, le membre pour Montréal se soit éveillé enfin pour s'apercevoir qu'il n'appartenait pas, qu'il ne pouvait pas appartenir au même parti que le membre pour Lambton?

On a beaucoup parlé du bill de la police. On dit que ce système n'est pas possible, que le besoin ne s'en est pas fait sentir et qu'on n'en a demandé nulle part l'introduction. N'en croyez rien, M. l'Orateur: dans plus d'une circonstance, le secours d'une police semblable eût été inappréciable, et il arrive tous les jours que dans nos villes, dans nos campagnes, on en éprouve le besoin.<sup>49</sup>

Une voix de la gauche [MR. BUREAU].--Pas dans les campagnes.<sup>50</sup>

MR. LORANGER.--Dans le comté de Napierville que représente l'hon. membre il peut se faire qu'on ne sente pas le besoin de cette police et il peut en être ainsi dans d'autres comtés, mais cela ne prouve pas que le pays entier n'en res[s]ente le besoin. Avec cette force publique, aurions-nous eu à regretter les scènes sanglantes et scandaleuses de 1849? Protégé par elle, le Parlement de Montréal aurait-il été brûlé? les rues de cette ville auraient-elles été ensanglantées encore à propos de cet aventurier religieux Gavazzi; la justice aurait-elle éprouvé tant d'entraves à St. Sylvestre? Dernièrement encore, une émeute au Sault St. Louis a été difficilement apaisée (sic) et plusieurs émeutiers ont échappé à la justice.

Dans ces grandes occasions, de quoi disposerons-nous pour réprimer la canaille? pour mettre fin à ces honteux dévergondages, pour empêcher ces grands malheurs? la force armée? La canaille ne croit pas à l'intervention de la force armée? Elle croit, et elle n'a pas tort, que c'est un remède si extrême, qu'on n'y a recours que lorsqu'il est presque trop tard, lorsqu'elle a commencé du moins ses exploits. Mais avec une police armée, l'on n'aurait pas à regretter l'occur[r]ence trop fréquente de scènes semblables.

Mais je ne m'appesantirai point pour le moment sur ces questions. En parlant de l'éducation, l'hon. membre pour Montréal a dit qu'ayant trouvé M. Chauveau inefficace comme secrétaire provincial, on en a fait un surintendant des écoles, (entendez, entendez.) Je crois que l'hon. membre regrette à présent ces paroles; je suis persuadé qu'il les doit regretter. M. Chauveau est un homme d'un talent reconnu et d'une aptitude réelle pour les fonctions qu'il remplit. L'année dernière, il était ici, au milieu de nous; pourquoi l'hon. membre ne l'a-t-il pas attaqué alors? Mais non, il a fallu attendre, pour lui lancer l'accusation, qu'il fût absent, incapable de se défendre. Cependant il a des amis dans cette chambre, et moi, qui m'ho[nore]

de me trouver parmi ces derniers, je me déclare son défenseur; je crois que M. Chauveau, grâce à ses études sur l'éducation aidées par une admirable intelligence, poussera la cause de l'enseignement, et lui donnera un tel développement que les adversaires du gouvernement n'auront pas la moindre excuse de parler sans cesse des écoles merveilleuses du Haut-Canada. Il n'y a pas jusqu'aux écoles normales dont M. Chauveau ne s'occupe activement.

M. l'Orateur, après avoir passé ainsi en revue les diverses mesures mentionnées dans le discours du trône et les amendement[s] relatifs à l'éducation, je signalerai ma disposition à soutenir le gouvernement, parce que je crois que c'est aujourd'hui le seul possible, qu'il offre le plus de garanties au pays et qu'il rallie autour de lui le plus grand nombre de sympathies.

Quant à l'opposition, elle est utile, ne serait-ce que pour empêcher l'administration de s'endormir ou de devenir despotique. Aussi mérite-t-elle bien du pays, mais à la condition toutefois de proposer de bonnes mesures, d'aider le gouvernement à marcher et non pas de l'entraver par dépit personnel.

L'opposition que nous avons devant nous a-t-elle rempli ces conditions? quelque[s] fois, il est vrai, elle a parlé de mesures favorables au pays; mais ces mesures, est-ce à l'opposition que le pays en est redevable? non, car elles ne venaient pas de cette dernière; elle ne se faisait que l'écho au lieu de donner la première idée, et quand l'opinion publique s'était prononcée sur une question, l'opposition mouche du coche politique, croyait l'avoir fait mouvoir parce qu'elle avait bourdonné alentour. Pauvre[s] gens! il faut, pour conduire un peuple, des hommes énergiquement trempés, aux principes arrêtés, aux convictions solides, aux nobles aspirations, et non des hommes qui peuvent tout au plus former en se groupant, pas un parti, mais une piteuse coterie qui cherche à se grandir par l'abaissement des autres. (M. Loranger s'assied au milieu de bruyants applaudissements.)<sup>51</sup>

MR. PAPIN, (also spoke in French)<sup>52</sup>. [Il] n'avait pas l'intention de parler, car les sujets devant la chambre ont été pleinement discutés; mais après les attaques du représentant de Laprairie, il croit devoir dire quelque chose. Les membres du gouvernement, qui se sont passé la fantaisie d'un tour d'Europe durant la vacance, n'ont pas eu le tems de préparer les mesures dont le pays avait besoin. Leurs fautes sont plutôt d'omission que de commission. Les membres du côté ministériel, afin d'attaquer les membres de l'opposition, ont interprété les paroles du représentant de Montréal de manière à faire croire qu'il avait dit quelque chose d'insultant pour les Canadiens-français du Bas-Canada. Mais ses paroles honnêtement interprétées ne peuvent pas avoir cette signification. Il a seulement montré par des chiffres qu'il y avait, en proportion, moins d'enfants fréquentant les écoles dans le Bas que dans le Haut-Canada; et ce fait n'est pas un déshonneur pour le peuple, mais il ne sert qu'à montrer, en le rapprochant avec d'autres faits, la négligence du gouver[nement] actuel et des gouvernements précédents au sujet de l'éducation dans le Bas-Canada.<sup>53</sup>

It being now six o'clock, MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair and the House adjourned.<sup>54</sup>

After the adjournment, at half-past seven,<sup>55</sup>

MR. FOLEY took the floor. He commenced by saying that he did not entirely concur with the remarks made on his (the opposition) side of the House. While in decided opposition to hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury Benches, he was free to confess that he was not altogether sure that hon. gentlemen on his side had not

deserved some censure for the course the Debate had taken. He thought, for example, that his hon. friends had been too severe in their censures on the Government on what they termed the omissions from the Speech. If hon. gentlemen had taken into consideration the circumstances of the case, the circumstances which had occurred during the recess, it appeared to him that they would have been more sparing of their censures of the Government on that ground. If, for example, they had taken into consideration the fact that the Government had hardly been long enough together during the recess to consult on any given subject, they would have been more sparing in their censures. If they had taken into consideration, that the President of the Legislative Council had been the greater part of the recess absent in England, on pretended public business, the nature of which, by the way, had not yet transpired, that the gallant Premier had also been absent in England during a large portion of the recess on business connected by rumor with the exaltation of his Excellency of Barbadoes--that the Receiver General had also been absent on business the nature of which had not yet transpired--that other members of the Cabinet had been absent during a large portion of the recess; if they had taken into consideration the facts that after their return to the Province it became necessary to make a tour of triumph and ... exultation with the late Premier, who was constantly accompanied by the hon'ble Postmaster General, and that after that it became necessary to hunt out a poor unfortunate Editor who had been so imprudent as to make some remarks in regard to certain Hamilton Debentures, and that the time of the Government was thus occupied in business which appeared to them to be of much greater importance than consultation on measures desired by the country. If they had taken all these circumstances into consideration, hon. gentlemen on his side would not, he thought, have been so severe in their censures on the Government. (Hear, hear.) So much by way of expressing his disapprobation of the course taken by hon. gentlemen on his own side of the house. And now with regard to the speech. He had little to say respecting it, for, as remarked by the hon. member for Essex it was a very lame affair; and in his country there was an old proverb referring to helping a lame dog over a still--he thought the member for Essex, (Mr. Rankin,) had done his handsomest by way of helping the government over the lameness they had introduced into their speech. (Hear, hear.) In fact, it occurred to him on the first reading of the speech, when he observed the loose and imperfect manner in which it was put together, and the want of harmony between its parts--the first idea that occurred to him was that it had been originally written in French by the hon. Postmaster General, and translated into English by the hon. Commissioner of Public Works. (Great laughter.) His hon. friend on his right hand from the land of cakes (Dr. Frazer) just now suggested to him, that it might be described as<sup>56</sup> "cauld kail het up again," a mere rehash of praises of past Legislation, with no hint of anything new. It was a speech that contained nothing but omissions on which it was quite within the rules of the House for the opposition to comment. In proof of this assertion he showed that, in 1854, the members<sup>57</sup> now occupying the Treasury Benches, voted for the amendment which turned out the late ministry, expressing regret that his Excellency had recommended no measures for the settlement of the Clergy Reserves and the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure. They did this, however, he might remark in passing, after they had voted down Mr. Hartman's amendment, which regretted that no measure for the secularization of the Reserves was recommended by his Excellency. That was the last public declaration on that subject made by those gentlemen before they went to the country. He mentioned that with special reference to a statement made in the course of the debate last night by the Inspector-General on the question of (sic) the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. It appeared from their vote against Mr. Hartman's amendment, notwithstanding the declaration made by several of them, that at the last election many of them were prepared to give up their peculiar

notions and declare in favour of secularization--it was evident from that vote that up to that moment at least they were as decidedly opposed to it as they had ever been before. (Hear, hear.) But by voting for the next amendment, which complained of an omission, expressing regret that the Governor did not recommend a measure for the settlement of the Reserve question, they succeeded in ousting the late Government and settling themselves in their places. (Hear, hear.) A great deal had been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side as to the want of adhesion among gentlemen on his side. It was said they were a rope of sand, and could not pull together; that they disagreed on some most important matters, and might be said in fact to be no opposition at all. He would ask, if there ever was an opposition agreed on everything? Did the hon. gentlemen themselves when in opposition agree? Did they agree with the hon. member for Lambton, who, he believed, was one of the most prominent members of the opposition to the late Government? Did they agree with the member for Haldimand who was also rather prominent in his opposition to the late Government? Did they agree with Mr. Papineau, another member of it? Such a taunt of a want of unity among the Opposition, came with a very ill grace from hon. gentlemen, who had themselves taken occasionally all sides of the political compass, and been yoke-fellows with everything in the shape of political parties, from the rabid Annexationists, to the highest Ultra Tories. And he was surprised especially that such taunts should have come from the hon. member for Northumberland. He would ask were the supporters of the Government at this moment agreed among themselves? Last session the member for Northumberland brought in a Bill for the establishment of Conciliation Courts.<sup>58</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--I never introduced any such Bill.<sup>59</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--Then it was for Arbitration. Were members on the Government side prepared to carry through that measure? Then it was said to be notorious that the member for Northumberland was an Ultra Radical. Were the members of the Government Ultra Radicals? It was said to be notorious that the member for Northumberland favored the doctrine of Universal Suffrage. Were the Government in favor of that?<sup>60</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--The hon. member has no foundation for making that statement. He never heard me say such a thing, or saw me vote for Universal Suffrage.<sup>61</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--There was one thing I did hear the hon. gentleman say, and I heartily agreed with him when he did say it, that he was opposed to the Militia Law. (Hear, hear.)<sup>62</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--I voted against it.<sup>63</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--He voted against it, and at that time was opposed to the policy of the Administration. And now he proposes voting for the Address, expressing satisfaction with it. Why then did he find fault with members of the Opposition for differing on some matters? Was it not notorious that he not only voted against that measure, but canvassed the members on both sides of the house for the purpose of inducing them, even at the risk of breaking up the Government, to vote against it? And was it not notorious that negotiations were actually in progress to procure seats on the Opposition side of the house for the hon. gentleman and his 11 or 12 followers who were to come over in opposition to the Government?<sup>64</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--You are drawing on your imagination.<sup>65</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--It is an imagination which can easily be established. Another hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, his hon. friend from Nicolet, brought in a

bill in the course of last session, to protect the rights of squatters--to allow parties who had settled down on lands for five or six years to hold them in perpetuity, in spite of the proprietors.<sup>66</sup>

DR. T. FORTIER, (Nicolet)--It was not my Bill, but the Bill of the member for Compton.<sup>67</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--The hon. gentleman surely forgets. I remember very well that a Bill was brought in by the member for Compton, but the member for Nicolet's Bill went a great deal farther. (Hear, hear.)<sup>68</sup>

DR. T. FORTIER.--I beg your pardon. My Bill was to facilitate the enregistering of titles of lands.<sup>69</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--Yes, and in fact that Bill was of so ultra Democratic a character, that even ultra Democratic gentlemen on the Opposition side could not support it. It was a Bill most Socialistic in its tendency, and declared to be so by the hon. Solicitor General for Upper Canada.--(Hear, hear.) When they saw those great discrepancies on the other side of the House, such inconsistencies among themselves, it was too much to taunt the Opposition with disunion.--They had heard the declaration of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address, that he supported the Administration, because it was a Conservative Administration. And they had the declaration of the member for Northumberland, that he supported it because it was a Radical Administration.<sup>70</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--I never said Radical.<sup>71</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--Reform, then.<sup>72</sup>

MR. S. SMITH.--I said Liberal.<sup>73</sup>

MR. FOLEY said he did not know the distinction between Liberal measures and Reform measures (sic), but he did see a distinction between that hon. gentleman's position, when he professed to be an ultra Reformer, and his position as an advocate and sustainer of an Administration, the members of which had for the most part been during their whole lives in opposition to the principles that hon. gentleman professed to hold. He knew that distinction, and he trusted the country would know it too. (Hear, hear.) The member for Quebec supported the Administration, because they were Conservative. The member for Northumberland on account of their Liberal or Reform measures, and the hon. member who seconded the Address said he was happy to find that a perfect combination had taken place, and that in fact the Government were neither Liberal nor Conservative, neither the one thing nor the other. And of these three descriptions of the Government, he was inclined to acquiesce in that given by the hon. member for Peterborough as the most correct. (Hear, hear.) And how could they on that side of the House be expected, as was suggested by some gentlemen on the other side, merely to echo the Speech? How could they be expected to say by their silence that they acquiesced in the equity and justice of the settlement that had taken place? How could they admit that the desires of the country for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves had been carried out, when hon. gentlemen told them that one church had been endowed with 250,000L and another with 114,000L, according to their own figures, and that other churches had been endowed to a proportionate extent? How could the country be satisfied with the mode in which the Clergy Reserves had been secularized, devoted to secular purposes, when

hon. gentlemen themselves admitted that more than one-half of the whole amount, upwards of 350,000L had been permanently settled upon the churches, while only 312,000L was to go to the municipalities.<sup>74</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY.--The hon. gentlemen (sic) forgets that nearly a million of acres are yet unsold.<sup>75</sup>

MR. FOLEY: It was a very difficult matter to understand what the Inspector-General meant. How could the Reformers echo his declaration upon that subject, when it was notorious that the very course had been taken by the hon. Inspector-General, which was denounced by Mr. Baldwin in 1846? What was asked upon that occasion by the Hon. Mr. Sherwood on the behalf of the Church of England? It was asked, that the amount of the Clergy Reserves belonging to the Church itself might be handed over to form a fund for Church endowment. That was the very project which was opposed by Mr. Baldwin and the Reform party in this House, and was the very means of reviving, as it were, the agitation of the question of the Clergy Reserves. What difference did it make that the money was handed over instead of lands? Was not the measure which these gentlemen had brought to a successful issue, in substance and effect, precisely the same measure which was opposed by Mr. Baldwin, and in which he was supported by the country?<sup>76</sup> Reformers could not approve of that. The members on the ministerial side had also taunted the opposition with the wandering out of the speech, but was the speech of the Governor at Hamilton to be found in the speech? Yet that was attacked; that was alluded to by Mr. Thibaudeau.<sup>77</sup> He regretted that another amendment was not proposed by his hon. friends upon his own side of the house, and that was with reference to the cumbrous and expensive militia system of last session--an Act which, he had no hesitation in declaring, had been condemned by the country from one end to the other. With regard to the establishment of a police force by the Government, sufficient had already been said to satisfy the House, or at least hon. gentlemen who were not tied to the government, that a more destructive measure as regarded the wants of the inhabitants of the country, could not by any possibility be introduced. Where was any necessity shown for the establishment of a police under the control of the government? Where had disturbances arisen in ten years past, that should give rise to the establishment of such a force?--Had it been called for by the country? Where was the evidence that the municipal authorities with the constabulary force at their disposal, were not perfectly competent to preserve the peace of the country. (Cries of no, no.) There was no evidence, that a police was necessary--<sup>78</sup>

A member--everywhere.<sup>79</sup>

[MR. FOLEY:] Reference had been made to the unfortunate occurrence at St. Sylvester. He asked whether the parties who then hid so long from justice, could have been more speedily detected had a police force under the direct control of the government, been in existence. Would a police under the control of the government, have been any more efficient and effective in quelling any disturbances, that have arisen in the country.<sup>80</sup> A riot had taken place at Toronto, but because the police force were not present, would the Government police if present have done better? yet all were brought to justice. So were the murderers of Mr. Nelles, though there were no detective police.<sup>81</sup> The gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches could not furnish any instances, in which the laws as they at present existed, have not been sufficient for a due administration of justice, when they were properly put into execution.--It appeared to him, that a more dangerous system, one better calculated to induce dissension and strife could not be introduced.

Reference had been made to the success of that system in Ireland, but he denied that it had been successful. Had agrarian outrages been subdued in that country? With all the efficiency of the police system there, with a large constabulary police force under the control of the government, was it not notorious that outrages of a more atrocious character than ever disgraced the annals of any country, occurred through the very instrumentality of that police, aggravated and pushed on by their secret manoeuvres for the purpose of keeping their places, and carrying out the policy of an unjust and tyrannical government? He trusted that in this country such an.... If unfortunately in obedience to the will of the Government, at the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Premier, a measure of this kind were inflicted upon the country, he was satisfied that in the course of a short time petitions would pour into this house from all parts of the Province, denouncing it as not only unnecessary and inexpedient, but unjust and tyrannical. (Cries of hear, hear.) It had been said, although the measure might not prove of any benefit to country neighborhoods, it was expedient that something of the kind should be established for the benefit of the larger municipalities. He would ask, if the governments of these municipalities were unable to suppress the outrages which took place in their own limits, if they were unable to protect the property of citizens who had chosen them for the positions which they occupied, if they had become so dead to their own interests, so unenergetic and so insufficient as to be unable to carry out the laws that already existed, why the people of the country should be called upon to pay for the administration of justice in these cities and towns? (Cries of hear, hear.) The people of the counties supported the administration of justice from their own means, and they had found that the constabulary force employed, was sufficient for that purpose. In times of popular elections when the government might think it necessary to use the police now demanded by the government, what would be the effect of sending them into the municipalities.<sup>82</sup> He had on this point the authority of the Ministry themselves,<sup>83</sup> though there were many grave omissions, there was one commodity in which the Speech abounded to overflowing.--That was the old stock in trade of the honorable and gallant Knight--loyalty! loyalty!! loyalty!!! We have an abundance of that.<sup>84</sup> He remembered the ridicule thrown by members of the present ministry on the force called the Prairie Hens--and this though Montreal was in full revolt, and had insulted Her Majesty and burned the Parliament House, being all the time backed up by the members of the present administration.<sup>85</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--No.<sup>86</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--Was not the hon. and gallant knight carried on the shoulders of the mob to Donegana's hotel?<sup>87</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--Then they backed him up. (Laughter.)<sup>88</sup>

MR. FOLEY.--Yes. And then the hon. gentleman<sup>89</sup> gave them such countenance and support as caused them to glory in their shame, (cries of hear, hear,) and caused them to feel as if they had triumphed not only over the representatives of the people, but also over the representative of royalty itself. If the gallant and honorable Knight and his friends had not stood in fear of the out-burst of indignation, which at that time, was excited in Upper Canada against them in consequence of the undefensible acts in which they took part, if they had not been afraid of the stalwart yeomanry of the country, who expressed their indignation of the course pursued by them in unmistakable terms, there was no telling to what their indisposition would have led them. The "London Times" said, in speaking of<sup>90</sup> Sir Allan's loyalty soon after the affair of Montreal: "The loyalty of that gentleman and his

friends," said the Times, "was the most embarrassing thing with which Her Majesty's Government had had to deal."<sup>91</sup> He had ever looked upon their loyalty as a mere means of obtaining place and power, because from what he had seen and read of the history of his country, he knew that as soon as the bread and butter were taken away from them, the loyalty went with it. Immediately after the return of the bread and butter, however, there would not be found a single speech of these gentlemen which was not full of expressions of loyalty. It surprised him to find to-night honourable gentlemen who had suffered from this so called loyalty, for he deemed it a spurious loyalty, in their persons as well as property, echoing a speech containing, as the honourable member from Essex (Mr. Rankin) said, nothing but lame and impotent conclusions. Gentlemen from Lower Canada had time and time again taunted gentlemen upon his side of the House with the fact, that whenever the proposition of representation by population had been introduced in this house, that they had been instrumental in bringing it forward. These gentlemen should recollect that it was the party whom they had now joined, after deserting their old friends, the Reformers of Upper Canada, which had kept Lower Canada in a position of inferiority to Upper Canada, by refusing her an equal representation even when she had a larger population. It was by the machinations of the gentlemen who now occupied the treasury benches, the people of Lower Canada were deprived of their constitution and had no means of expressing their sentiments in regard to it. They should remember that even in that time of their adversity as well as in their times of prosperity, the Reformers of Upper Canada had always stood by them. When gentlemen from Lower Canada allude to the injustice that has been practised towards them, they ought to put the blame where it properly belonged. As a reformer who had ever occupied an humble position in the ranks of the party, he would say that whatever might have taken place in later days, taunts of the description they had heard coming from hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada were undeserved, because the blame, if it rested any where, should rest with the hon. gentlemen who now occupied seats upon the treasury benches.<sup>92</sup> He ... reminded the House of the insults heaped by Sir Allan on the French Canadians; and declared in reference to the representation of the two sections of the province, that it was not the reformers, but the tories of Upper Canada who had prevented the Lower Canadians from having a fair representation in the Parliament when the union was effected<sup>93</sup>. He would revert for a moment to some of the administrative acts of the government. It was said when they acquired power that they had abandoned their old prejudices, that they had adopted the platform of the Reformers--that they were converts and would henceforth be the most liberal government that ever existed. He asked gentlemen to look at their administrative acts and the appointments they had made. Had they furnished in this respect evidence of their liberality, of their conversion to reform principles, or that they had forgotten their old feelings and principles. If they searched from one end of the Province to the other, they would find perhaps reformers appointed to mere paltry offices, such as surveyor or clerk of customs, while they were excluded entirely from the more important offices in the gift of the administration. He ventured the assertion that for every one reformer appointed to office there had been three Tories appointed<sup>94</sup>, and this though two-thirds of the Upper Canadian supporters of the Ministry were reformers. Even at their very first accession to office, while overwhelming Lord Elgin with gratitude and praise, they gave one of the most important offices in the country to a gentleman who had prepared to welcome his lordship on his first visit to Upper Canada, with a volley of rotten eggs! Another appointment on which he remarked was, that of the son of Bishop Strachan to the professorship of Huron. Now he contended that those who were appointed to places of emolument should be the men who had supported the Ministerial policy, which it was notorious that Mr. Strachan as an ultra tory did not do.<sup>95</sup> He could

mention other instances in which they had been equally forgetful of their new allies. He asked those hon. gentlemen, were they doing justice to themselves and their party--composing as they did two-thirds of it--to suffer their opponents, and the professed opponents of the Administration themselves, to be appointed to places of emolument? We had a commission appointed to revise the laws. It was to be expected that gentlemen occupying seats upon this side of the House would have been placed upon that Commission; but they have had no voice in the matter, he should judge from the political complexion of the gentlemen who occupy a majority of the seats in that Commission.<sup>96</sup> All the able lawyers of the reform party were excluded. Then analysing the composition of the Ministerial party, he said, it consisted of the bad end of all parties, comprising the ultras of both classes, the ultra-Conservatives and the ultra-Radicals<sup>97</sup>. Accusations had been made against the members of the House, because of their dissensions. He asked if they had not also existed upon the other side of the House. He had intended to refer to the circumstances under which the Administration was formed, but that subject had been so amply dilated upon by other gentlemen who had preceded him, that he felt it unnecessary for him to do so. If the gentlemen who now occupied seats upon the Treasury Benches because of their opposition to the late Administration, had that modicum of fair play and honesty to which they laid claim, they would never, after the result of the labors of the Committee of the House appointed to investigate the conduct of the members of the late Administration have continued to occupy the places for a single day, which they now continued to hold. What was one of the principal causes that led to the destruction of the late administration? It was the bringing against them by the administration parties now in power, charges of corruption and misdemeanor, which if true, ought to have condemned them not only as politicians, but as honourable men. It was by accusing the late Inspector General, (the Hon. Francis Hincks) and his colleagues, of high crimes and misdemeanors, that they succeeded in gaining the places they now held. Immediately after their accession to power they professed to do justice to these gentlemen, but according to their own showing, these very accusations presented by them against their predecessors were declared to be utterly false and groundless. If they believed in reality that the late Inspector General and his colleagues had not been guilty of the crimes and misdemeanors they alleged against them, it was their duty to have said to these gentlemen immediately "we have wronged you, and have brought false accusations against you by reason of which we have obtained your places, and as a matter of right and justice we ask you to resume them." Although he had occupied the attention of the House so long, he felt that he could not sit down without again expressing his condemnation of the course of hypocrisy and deception which characterized the administration in obtaining the places they now held, nor without expressing his deep regret that honorable gentlemen who still professed to adhere to Reform principles should give their support to an administration, which had, in every respect, failed to carry out the wishes of the country, and which during its existence appeared to have had for its chief object the retention of place at all hazards and at any sacrifice of principle. He trusted, that the time would come when these honorable gentlemen would be called upon to give an account for their conduct to the country which they now defied.<sup>98</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE rose and wished to make some explanation in regard to a statement he had made on the previous evening, which had been contradicted by the hon. and gallant knight opposite. He<sup>99</sup> asked leave to read some extracts from the Quebec Gazette in reference to the speech of Sir Allan MacNab<sup>100</sup> to show that what he had said was facts.<sup>101</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said if it was merely an explanation as to any statement, he might give it, but it was contrary to the usage of the House to allow him to read from any volume such as that, merely to confirm his former statements.<sup>102</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said he was sure he would not be allowed to read it.<sup>103</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB replied to the remarks of the hon. member for Waterloo. He referred at the commencement of his remarks to the course pursued by the hon. member for Haldimand, who, he said, had spent a whole life in cutting from newspapers everything vile and infamous that had been said of every public man of character in Upper Canada. He had spent a lifetime in cutting out these scraps, and he is occupied daily in the House, with the pastepot and a penknife, cutting from papers everything that is said discreditable to any gentleman of influence or character in this Province. He would ask this House if ever that hon. gentleman was known to say a good word of any of the men who occupy those benches. So far as he himself was concerned, he did not care what he said, and he believed the country did not care what he said.<sup>104</sup>

Hear, hear, from MR. MACKENZIE<sup>105</sup>.

[MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB continued:] Throughout the length and breadth of the land nobody, he was certain, cared for what that hon. gentleman said. (Hear, hear.) He [Mr. MacNab] seldom rose to address the House, and he thought he might be heard occasionally, especially when he felt it necessary to defend himself from the accusations made by the hon. member from Waterloo. One would have supposed, to hear that hon. gentleman speak, that he had been a long time in public life. Hon. gentlemen would have been led to believe that that hon. member had been a long time in Parliament, and was well known to the people of Upper Canada, and exercised a large influence over them, and, therefore, was entitled to speak with that degree of confidence which he had done on public matters. He would tell that hon. gentleman that there were members in this House who had been returned to it again and again, and had occupied seats around him, and were members of Parliament before that hon. gentleman was born. This was but ... the second session of Parliament that that hon. gentleman has occupied a seat in this House, and yet he pretended to lecture the Administration about their conduct on certain things of which, from his remarks, he seems to know very little. (Hear, hear.) He was pleased to allude to the Union of the Provinces and to the part he (Sir Allan) took with regard to that question, and to the conduct of those with whom he acted. But he seems not to know that it was the party to which he belongs that took part with Lord Sydenham, when he carried the election by bludgeons against the men of French origin. He (Sir Allan) had the honor of acting with those gentlemen of French origin and of endeavouring to secure to them those rights they demanded. (Hear, hear.) But that hon. gentleman evidently knew very little about what he had been speaking of. He (Sir Allan) had been continually accused of the course he took on the Clergy Reserves question; but he would say that there was no action he had ever taken upon any question in this House, of which he was prouder than of his action on the Clergy Reserves. For twenty-five years he opposed the Secularization of the Reserves. He believed they were intended for the support of religion in this country, and he had all along endeavored to maintain them for that purpose. But after this measure had been sent over to England asking power to legislate upon the question after the Imperial Parliament had again given permission to settle this question--(for it was well known that the people of England desired Secularization), and when there seemed a

general determination throughout the country that these Reserves should be Secularized, he (Sir Allan) expressed his opinion to his friends, that if the verdict of the country was expressed, fully, fairly, and largely in favor of Secularization, he would never offer any further opposition to it. At the general election which immediately preceded the formation of the present administration, he did not make any public statements on the hustings to that effect; but to his friends at the time, that if such was the opinion of the country he would abandon (sic) all further opposition. What was the first vote in the House on this question?--95 to 13. That was sufficient to satisfy him of the determination of the country, and it would not have been right in him to offer further opposition. Now the best arrangement that could have been made was made, and he knew men of high standing--men of large political influence--men of character--honest men--who had told him over and over again that they were perfectly satisfied with the way in which that question was settled, and they thanked God that that long vexed question was settled. If he had a hand in that settlement he was proud of it, and he believed the country, with the exception of a few factious demagogues, who desired to keep up political factions in the country, was perfectly satisfied. He did not intend to shrink from the responsibility he took in settling this question. He was glad of it. He was proud of it. The best men of political standing in the country are of the same way of thinking. He had represented Wentworth for many years. He had represented the city of Hamilton for many years, and neither of these constituencies had objected to the course he had pursued. There are men in the city of Hamilton quite the equal of the hon. gentleman opposite--men who understood that question well, and what was their course towards him when he accepted office. He never left Quebec, but was elected by them, knowing the course he had taken and intended to take in this question. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, had taken the course the Opposition have generally taken in this matter. They do not make any direct charge against the Government, but content themselves (sic) with dealing in generalities. They go back over the journals of the House for years, and make all sort of statements. But if they don't think the Government are doing what is right they have the power in their own hands. Why don't they exercise it? But he would ask where was there an administration in this country which was universally approved of? The hon. gentleman spoke of the appointments which have been made by this administration. He speaks of Mr. Strachan as having been appointed a judge in the district of Huron. He thought the people of that district should be as well able to form an opinion of who should be a judge as the hon. gentleman opposite, and he, (Sir Allan) could say that the people of that district were perfectly satisfied with the appointment of Mr. Strachan. They say he makes a good judge, and he (Sir Allan) was satisfied from his knowledge of him that their opinion was correct.<sup>106</sup> The member for Waterloo had said nothing about the appointment of Mr. Ridout to a place of 1000L a-year, though he had always been a reformer.<sup>107</sup> The hon. gentleman had alluded to several other appointments which had been made, but, notwithstanding what that hon. gentleman had said, he (Sir Allan) could name two Reformers for every one Conservative that had been appointed--(cries of name, name.) The hon. and gallant Knight was proceeding to name, when<sup>108</sup>--

The House decided against it.<sup>109</sup>

[MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB] said that what he had asserted was a fact and the records of the country would show it. He had the honor of acting with Reformers (sic) in the government as well as out of the government, and he respected their feelings, and he would declare that he would rather give a majority of the appointments to them than keep them from them<sup>110</sup> [OR] than to be at continual war with the hon. gentlemen.<sup>111</sup>

Laughter in some of the Opposition benches.<sup>112</sup>

[MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB continued:] Hon. gentlemen laugh--but he knew he would be believed when he said so, for there have been more appointments of Reformers than of Conservatives. He thought the Reformers in the government were entitled to their share of the appointments, for they had good heads and stout hearts, and a thorough determination to do their utmost for the best interests of the country. With regard to the Police Bill, hon. gentlemen opposite say there is no necessity for a Police Bill in this country. The same was said in England when Mr. Peel brought in his bill, and now it is admitted that there is no better police force in the world than are to be found in the city of London. This measure had occupied the serious consideration of the government. They felt the necessity of such a force. He believed the country would be satisfied with such a force.<sup>113</sup> Can gentlemen for a moment doubt but that the riots of Montreal, Quebec and St. Sylvester would have been better put down had an efficient system of police been in requisition.<sup>114</sup> He believed had such a force been in existence the proceedings connected with the St. Sylvester murder would have been more satisfactorily brought to light. The bill had received the best consideration at the hands of the Government, and would be submitted to this House, and if there were any honorable gentleman on his side of the House who would support it, he believed the Government would be able to convince them of the necessity of the Bill, and he hoped it would pass. Honorable gentlemen opposite, he believed, would not support it, but they would admit, at all events, when it was introduced, that the government had been endeavoring to frame a Bill to meet the exigencies of the case. If it was necessary to confine the measure to cities and towns, instead of making it include rural districts also, that might be done.<sup>115</sup>

Hear, hear, from the Opposition<sup>116</sup>.

[MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB continued:] A great deal had been said about the Speech not containing all that honorable gentlemen opposite desired. (Hear, hear). He did not know what the honorable gentlemen would desire, unless it were that they should have put something into the Speech to afford these honorable gentlemen an opportunity of carrying some resolution in opposition to it. If they wished to tell him that the whole of the legislation of the country was to be alluded to in that speech, he would ask them to find an example for such a thing. In England, in the House of Commons, even at the last opening, the whole thing was settled on that day, and yet honorable gentlemen are not satisfied because the speech does not afford more room for discussion. To be sure, it did contain an allusion to the Clergy Reserves, and without that allusion, his honorable friend opposite (Mr. Brown) could not have found matter for his speech. In fact his speech was almost entirely made up of secularization matters. The Seigniorial Tenure Bill had also been introduced, and so far it was fortunate for the member of Montreal (Mr. Dorion). The honorable gentleman smiles, but that allusion afforded him an opportunity of making a speech on that subject. They had alluded to the Legislative Council Bill, but it was not sufficiently strong to meet the views of the honorable gentleman opposite, (Mr. Brown) although he opposed it. That allusion was, however, an evidence that they intendend (sic) to introduce a bill, and they intend to carry it, too.<sup>117</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>118</sup>

MR. BROWN here was understood to say that he did not make the observation in regard to the Legislative Council Bill.<sup>119</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB proceeded. He said he understood that honorable gentleman to have made the reference to the proposed Legislative Council Bill but there was very little difference, for the opposition from the other side seemed to be a sort of Union opposition; it pushed all from one point. One thing seemed evident, that the Clear Grits were represented by the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. member for Lambton was the head of the Clear Grit opposition, and the hon. member for Lambton was the tail of the Clear Grits, and there was an end of it, (hear, hear.)<sup>120</sup> He proceeded to consider the points of the Speech, remarking briefly on the railway, the legal reforms--the features of which, he said, it was not necessary to detail in a speech--and the Ecclesiassical (sic) Institutions. On the latter he said that it was at the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton that this measure was taken up, and it was introduced into the speech for him, and now he was not pleased with it.<sup>121</sup> But he (Sir Allan) did not think that any government could suffer from the kind of attacks made upon them from the opposite side. When any gentleman attacked them for acting improperly, he should define the particular act. But the Government were accused of all kinds of things, in general terms. Every serious matter that has been put forward by the opposite side of the House, in a tangible shape, has been refuted. Under all these circumstances, he did not think the government would suffer in the opinion of the country at all by the opposition they were receiving. He believed that his colleagues were influenced by no other desire than to carry on the business of this country in a manner advantageous to it. He did not think they had any personal feelings to gratify, nor were actuated by any motives of that kind. With regard to those charges brought more particularly against himself, he would simply say, as he said before, and he would not again allude to the subject--he would say that there was no act of his life he was so glad of having performed, no act of which he was so proud, as in having assisted to settle the Clergy Reserves for he believed that settlement was acceptable to the great majority of the people of this country.<sup>122</sup>

MR. ROBINSON rose to correct one of the statements of the hon. member for Waterloo, who had charged the hon. and gallant knight with having voted to deprive the Lower Canadians of their representative right when the union act was framed, whereas the fact was that at that time the hon. gentleman was not on the floor of the house, but occupied the position of Speaker.<sup>123</sup>

MR. FOLEY said the hon. member for Simcoe had misconceived his remarks. He had made no reference specially to the Premier personally, but only as the representative of the Tory party, from which undoubtedly the proposition had come.<sup>124</sup>

CAPT. RHODES said that the speech of the honorable member for Waterloo had apparently produced some impression on the House, as the Premier had replied to him; but the impression on his mind was,<sup>125</sup> that much time had been consumed in remarks which were but little pertinent to the business for which they were assembled. He should not himself contribute to this, but he had information upon one of the topics which had been handled by the hon. member for Waterloo, and which he thought it would not be irrelevant for him to communicate to the House. That hon. gentleman, in his consideration of the question how far a Provincial police was necessary, had passed lightly over the affair of the St. Sylvester murder. It was likely that he should feel more sensibly the occurrence, inasmuch as the man so murdered was a member of the same Church with himself. In speaking of the transaction, he would be as temperate as the nature of the case, and his own feelings, would permit him to be. The hon. gentleman proceeded to relate the circumstances of the murder.... He dwelt upon the length of time that elapsed before the parties could be arrested, and

at last they had surrendered themselves just before the time of the Assizes. The hon. member considered that the guilt of the parties was fully established by the evidence, but the result, as they all knew, was an acquittal. That verdict was a legal one, but he would not admit that it was a true one. He maintained that justice had not prevailed in the case. It was now evident that there was little or no protection for life; the parties would have to depend for the protection of their lives and property upon themselves. Of this they were well aware; and the consequence was, that a very large proportion of the people of the district, both Catholics and Protestants, now went armed.<sup>126</sup> They thought they might fight out their own quarrels, and right their own wrongs.<sup>127</sup> There were many members present who were acquainted with these facts. This was a strong argument for the establishment of the Provincial Police proposed. The widow of Corrigan was, he believed, endeavouring to practise, under these terrible circumstances, the state of mind [of] becoming a Christian. But much it might be feared that this would not continue.<sup>128</sup> [OR] He feared the widow of the murdered man, instead of seeking grace or resignation from on high, would cherish the spirit of revenge common in those classes.<sup>129</sup> She would inherit the antipathies of the deceased. The large Orange bands of the locality would foster this spirit, and the children would, as they grew up, be sent forth to revenge the death of their father. He would say if this should come to pass, he hoped the hon. member for Waterloo would not be the judge who would have to pass sentence upon a son of the deceased. This was not the state of things they could wish to see continued. The constabulary force of the country was not enough in such circumstances. He was himself entirely unconnected with either of the parties thus opposed to each other--either the Orange or the Ribbon men. And from his own observation he was ready to admit that the Orangemen were not more obedient to the law than their adversaries.<sup>130</sup> Both had assembled with arms in their hands to prevent the sittings of the Municipal Council.<sup>131</sup> They could not, as things at present were, enforce the laws. The establishment of a Provincial Police would be the commencement of order in Lower Canada. The late trial (Corrigan's at Quebec,) was not creditable to the Court.<sup>132</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER called the hon. member to order.<sup>133</sup>

CAPT. RHODES resumed. He was not aware that it was out of order for him as a member of Parliament to allude to what had taken place in a court of law. He would merely say, however, that he did not think that gibes and jests were becoming a court of justice.<sup>134</sup> He thought that the levity displayed on that occasion by those who presided and took part in the trial, deserved emphatic condemnation. (Hear, hear.)<sup>135</sup>

MR. JACKSON would take the occasion to say that he was ready to repeat his approval of the secularization of the Reserves, and of the mode in which it had been carried out. He was convinced that this was accordant with the opinion of the greater number of thinking men in the Province. He was not apprehensive of danger to the public interests from this cause. The sums thus received were small in proportion to the means of the country, and were more than compensated by the influence which the parties would exercise for good according to the liberal principles of the age.<sup>136</sup> Having healed the breach, so long kept festering, men of different creeds would now work together more harmoniously, and those who had contended for the voluntary principle would be able to show to the world its advantages. He would also offer a few observations upon the Education question. To his mind there did not appear to be any reasonable objection to the proposed plan. The time, he thought, would soon arrive when the whole School System would have to

be discussed and revised, when it was probable that a national system would have to be adopted.<sup>137</sup> He could not see the difference between national education and separate schools. He regretted that these had been opposed, though he was not sorry that the question had been discussed. All school systems must be re-discussed. The system of schools as first established had been overrated. He had no sympathy with the opinions now generally expressed. He then adverted to the bill for private incorporations. It was calculated to prevent inquietude in the public mind. It was not their business to defend ministers.--They must defend themselves.<sup>138</sup> The member for Lambton had accused the conservative members of the Cabinet for deserting their principles when they took office.<sup>139</sup> They had come to the ranks of reformers, and it certainly was not for the Reformers to reproach them that they had at last ranged on the right side. Since they had done so, there was no inconsistency in Reformers supporting them. The member for Lincoln had confessed that no better government could be formed. He (Mr. J.) did not, however, therefore wish to see them unopposed. He only regretted that the Opposition were no better founded--based upon some more definite principles. Agitation was necessary to purity. But he questioned very much the propriety of any opposition merely against men. They on the Ministerial side were consistent, they gave their support because they approved their measures. They had great interests to attend to, and should not be thwarted for the sake of opposition. He thought the speech of the hon. gentlemen (*sic*) from Waterloo was damaging to his own reputation. For himself he had one, a straightforward course to take. So long as the measures of ministers were good, they should have his support.<sup>140</sup>

MR. BOWES would make one or two remarks in reference to an observation which fell from the hon. member for Waterloo. It was his opinion that the great merit of the speech consisted in its reference to the establishment of a Provincial Police Force in the country. True, such a system had been strongly objected to, and it had been said that a Police Force under the control of Government, would not work well. But if they had seen as he had done, the evils which resulted from the present system, they would feel the imperative necessity which existed for the establishment of a Police Force which should be independent of the municipalities. They would see that an efficient Police Force could never be established on other principles. If reasons were wanted to show the necessity for this police system, he would refer to Quebec, to the Gavazzi riot--which could not be suppressed there. As soon as that political humbug began to speak, he was attacked by the ... mob, and the police were unable to protect him. He also came to Montreal and the same result occurred. And in Toronto we hear the Chief of Police stating that it is impossible for him to control the Police Force of the city.<sup>141</sup> He begged also to make a remark on another subject referred to by one or two members in the course of the Debate. A petition had been presented to this House by the honorable member for North York, from the Council of the United Counties of York and Peel, requesting a repeal of that portion of the Common School Act which referred to Separate Schools. Now he respected the opinion of the Municipalities of York and Peel, and he respected the opinion of the hon. member that brought in that petition, but he held in his hand an authority which he respected much more than he did either the Municipalities of York and Peel, or the hon. member from North York.<sup>142</sup> Dr. Ryerson's opinions would not, he opined, be questioned by any hon. member of that House; for he had searched through the world to find a system suitable to this Province, and had come near attaining his object--only wanting aid at their hands to fully develop the utility of the system. The hon. gentleman then read an extract from Dr. Ryerson's Report on Common Schools, p. 232<sup>143</sup>, to the effect that in Dr. R's. opinion the abolition of the Separate School provision of the School Law would greatly impede the advancement of the system, and do injury to all parties concerned.<sup>144</sup>

MR. HARTMAN.--What is the date of that Report?<sup>145</sup>

MR. BOWES.--The date of the Report is 1852, and after three years' experience it is repeated in the Report of 1855.<sup>146</sup>

...--I was not aware that the Report ... been published.<sup>147</sup>

[MR. BOWES:] These, continued the hon. gentleman, and all other provisions of the school law, had been considered from time to time, and were unconnected with politics or party. They had been introduced into the Legislature under the auspices of four different administrations. And he sincerely hoped it would not be made a subject of political agitation. With reference to the Clergy Reserves, he was glad that question had been settled, but regretted the manner of settlement.<sup>148</sup> He trusted the honorable gentleman would allow his petition to remain on the table, and lend his assistance to those who were seeking faithfully to carry out the provisions of the present school laws. And now, while on his feet, he would refer to a petition, which he presented here a few days ago, with regard to a change in the law relative to the Trustees of Separate Schools in Toronto, and to relieve the clerk of the municipality from the difficulties under which he laboured, under the 12th clause of the late Act. It would be found that the bill he was about to bring in asked nothing additional for Separate Schools. It asked nothing but a relief, and a check upon the contributors to Separate Schools in Toronto and throughout the country. He would say nothing more on that subject, as he would have another opportunity of speaking to it. The hon. member then referred to the passage in the speech relating to the trade of the country<sup>149</sup>. He commended the Inspector General--when he was member of a former administration for having helped to secure the removal of the differential system of duties which prevented the growth of the wholesale trade of Upper Canada.<sup>150</sup> The difficulties under which trade suffered were not the fault of the Government. The lumber trade suffered because prices had fallen in England. The other branches of trade suffered in Lower Canada, because it no longer had the monopoly, which differential duties formerly gave it. The produce of this part of the country was sent to the United States, because of the great demand there, and the high prices, making a better market there than in Liverpool.<sup>151</sup> Before resuming his seat he would say there was one subject which, he regretted had been omitted from the speech. He alluded to temperance. It pained him to see that the temperance advocates in that House had dwindled down to himself--to one who had formerly opposed a prohibitory measure. But he still hoped however, that the present Government would bring in a measure for the suppression of temperance. (Loud laughter.) Being an Irishman, he claimed the privilege of speaking twice, and would say, in amendment, that he had just spoken the very opposite of what he meant. He was going to say that the Government ought to assume the responsibility of a stringent temperance measure--not a measure imported from the other side of the water. For he thought that the hon. member (Mr. Felton) who introduced a Temperance measure last session had made a very serious mistake in importing it across the border. Had that hon. gentleman handed in a proper measure which had not been so imported, it would no doubt have commanded the attention, if not the approval, of the house. The necessity of such a measure was, we regret to say, too apparent. What has filled the jails, asylums and penitentiaries but intemperance (sic)? And of those parties confined in the jail of this city, how many had gone there, directly or indirectly, through the influence of the inordinate indulgence in intoxicating drinks? Fully four-fifths. This measure was he believed the only thing omitted from the Address, and the omission was the more inexcusable as such a law had been asked for from one end of Canada--not of the Upper Province

alone--but from one end of Canada to the other.<sup>152</sup> All over the country there was a cry for a stringent license law, which was demanded by petitions that represented the voice of the people, in a very different way from the mere handful that called for the abolition of Separate Schools.<sup>153</sup> He had opposed the Prohibitory Law because he believed it would have done injustice to those parties who had invested their money in the tariff (sic), under the laws of the country. He felt confident that if the government [had] done their duty in this matter and introduced a proper measure they would be supported in it. In conclusion he stated his intention of opposing the amendment of the honorable member for Lambton.<sup>154</sup>

MR. FERRES would say one word about the remarks of the member for Toronto, about the trade of Montreal. He was happy that he had not, like too many others, spoken in a disparaging or unfriendly spirit about the mercantile community there. He had alluded, however, to the trade of Montreal as only the trade of that locality. It had two branches--that of Montreal proper, and that of the rest of the Province passing through it. The trade proper was in a most healthy condition. There was only a decrease of the trade passing through Montreal. He was sorry a recent report of the Board of Trade had, to a certain extent, sanctioned the opinion that the trade of Montreal, generally was decreasing. It was only that trade which passed through it, which was, to a certain extent, finding other channels. Its peculiar trade was in a flourishing state, and the city itself was growing.<sup>155</sup>

MR. YOUNG did not think this matter of Lower Canada trade was properly understood and some injustice was done to the Lower Canada merchant. Formerly the Canadian merchant could not buy goods abroad unless they were sent out in British ships. He could not even do that directly. He was in the Mediterranean some years ago, and made purchases of produce there, but he could not ship it to Montreal though he found a British vessel there, but must send them first to Liverpool and warehouse them there. Lower Canada merchants were fettered by these restrictions until Sir R. Peel's policy changed this, and they were enabled to import directly. Then followed the bonding transit draw-back system in the United States, which opened up facilities for imports through that country. But another difficulty remained; the Navigation Laws were not repealed for two years afterwards. In the meantime, trade had won for itself channels through the States. The Lower Canadian merchant, entered into competition with the United States merchant, at a great disadvantage, and he was quite ready to admit they could not now compete with them for the trade of Upper Canada, and that was owing to the fact that our system of public works, grand as they might be, were not yet complete. The Lower Canadian merchants asked no advantage at the expense of Upper Canada. He had retired from the ministry rather than impose a differential retaliatory tariff on the imports of Upper Canada by way of the States.--But, he asked ministers to do justice to the representatives (sic) of the commercial community of Lower Canada. The representatives of Lower Canada in the cabinet had not given their province that attention, or insisted upon justice being done, as they ought to have done. The feeling was too prevalent among Upper Canadians that they cared nothing for Lower Canada or its prosperity, and rather preferred to hold up the cities of the United States. If that feeling continued (sic), the Union could not last. Upper Canadians should feel proud in the prosperity of their own seaports, rather than seek to gain advantages for those of a foreign country.<sup>156</sup>

MR. HARTMAN stated that the hon. member for Toronto had not quoted so correctly or so fully from Dr. Ryerson's report on the subject of Separate Schools as he should have done. Nor did he say what it was very important he should have said,

that Dr. Ryerson's remark had reference, not to the existing School Act, but to the School Law in existence in 1852, the provisions of which in regard to Separate Schools were very different from the present.<sup>157</sup>

MR. BOWES. He approved of the present also.<sup>158</sup>

[MR. HARTMAN continued:] The member for Toronto had said that he (Mr. H.) had presented a petition on the same subject, but he might have pointed to a great many other gentlemen, members of the House, who had presented similar petitions. (Hear, hear.) And if he (Mr. H.) was correctly informed, and the prepared Bill was introduced and likely to be carried, that table would not hold the petitions that would be sent in against it. (Hear, hear.)<sup>159</sup>

MR. BOWES.--Have you seen the Bill?<sup>160</sup>

MR. HARTMAN said that he had heard what was in the Bill, and he had heard what the hon. gentleman's colleague (Mr. Cameron) had said about it that afternoon, that he would never agree to any such extension of the Separate School system as was sought for. And the hon. gentleman knew very well that he would stand almost alone among those who agreed with him in general politics, if he attempted to advocate that extension. If he did not find the hon. gentleman and his colleague fighting on opposite sides in that question, he was no prophet. He would now call the attention of the (sic) House to what the state of the School law was in 1852. Under that law a Separate School was only possible in these circumstances, that when the teacher or teachers were Protestants, there might be a Roman Catholic Separate School, and when the teacher or teachers were Roman Catholics, there might be a (sic) Protestant Separate School. Was that the case now? There was no such proviso in the Separate School Law forced upon the country last session, not by a majority of Upper Canadians, but by the Administration, backed as they were by the Lower Canadians. But a little further on in the same document from which the member for Toronto had read, what did Dr. Ryerson say? He said--"The most, and in my opinion only effectual method of causing the ultimate discontinuance and abandonment of Separate Schools, is to retain the existing provisions of the law on the subject. I do not think the grounds on which Separate Schools are established, are valid. I do not think there is any reasonable necessity for such schools. I think the law provides amply for the protection of the religious faith and morals of all classes in the public schools. I think those who establish Separate Schools voluntarily and needlessly, place themselves and their children at a disadvantage, in regard to sound education, and in relation to the community at large." (Hear, hear.) As to the question of temperance, the country was calling out loudly against the evils of intemperance, and demanding a stringent measure to repress them; and the hon. gentleman would (sic) have an opportunity of expressing his opinion on the principle of that law very soon. (Hear, hear.)<sup>161</sup>

MR. J. DORION, (Drummond,) did not rise to prolong the debate, but he could not allow certain remarks of the hon. member for Megantic, (Capt. Rhodes,) to pass. That hon. gentleman referred to the state of the eastern part of Canada, as showing the necessity there was for establishing a Government Police. The hon. gentleman related some facts connected with the St. Sylvester murder, and he (Mr. D.) wished now to relate an occurrence that took place also in a rural part of Lower Canada, to prove that even had the proposed Government force been in existence, it would have been of no service there. There was something in this country already in the shape of a government police. He had no doubt every member of the House had heard of

Major Johnstone's police force in the eastern part of Canada. In Richmond last summer, of six large country stores there, four were burned down in the space of three or four months, there could be no doubt by incendiaries, notwithstanding (sic) the presence of Major Johnston's police force. And the people became so alarmed, that they sat up night after night to watch their property. The guilty parties were now in the Penitentiary, but that government police had no hand in arresting them. (Hear, hear.) It was through the instrumentality of Mr. Fortier, a merchant in Richmond, who kept up his own men to watch his property during the night, that the arrests were made, and the guilty parties handed over to justice. (Hear, hear.) If the members of this House were to hear what the people of Richmond had to say about the government police, they would find few arguments for the establishment of the provincial force contemplated by the government. (Hear, hear.) There was so little necessity for a Police that in some parts of Lower Canada, they had not even a word to express "a row." (Laughter.) In the district south of Quebec, there had not been a row since 1775, when some of them were disposed to join the Americans. He did not believe there was a county in Lower Canada, and perhaps not even a city, the people of which would not strongly oppose the government scheme. What Lower Canada wanted was, not to squander public money on a useless police force, but to have a larger amount of money applied to common schools. (Hear, hear.) He would like to know what a police force would have done to improve the Quebec jury, who incriminated themselves in the St. Sylvester murder. (Hear, hear.) He took it that the best thing they could do for Lower Canada was to open up good schools and increase good teachers, and bring up the youth of the country in such a way as would make them good citizens and capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, so that when called to act as a jury, they might know how to distribute equal-handed justice. (Hear, hear.) There was one other remark he wished to make. A government police force was sent to St. Sylvestre, but did they make any arrests? They could not hunt up the parties, and a body of troops sent out were equally unsuccessful, and it was not till some understanding had been come to with the parties implicated, through the channel of certain members of the bar of Quebec, that they went and voluntarily gave themselves up. (Hear, hear.)<sup>162</sup>

MR. FERRIE did not intend to take part in the general debate, but merely wished to notice a remark of the honourable member for Montreal, (Mr. Young.) That honourable gentleman said that members for Upper Canada generally took no interest in the trade of Montreal. As a merchant and miller, of Upper Canada, he desired to say that he felt the deepest interest in the trade of the St. Lawrence, and would rejoice if produce could be sent from the west by that route, as advantageously as by New York or Boston. If any measures could be devised by the honourable member which would tend to that end, he would find no lack of support from him (Mr. Ferrie.) He desired to see the trade of the St. Lawrence (sic) with the West Indies and with countries more distant, extended. And if measures could be devised for that purpose also, the honourable member would find that all Upper Canada were not averse to them.<sup>163</sup>

MR. FELTON explained that it was the police which ferretted out the assassins at Richmond. But that force was not fitted for the general protection of the country. Their duties were confined to the maintenance of peace along the railway at St. Hyacinthe. At St. Sylvester the accused men had first been hunted by partisans, and so the feelings of the opposite faction had been roused to protect them. Had the police stepped in between them in the first instance, that would not have been the case.<sup>164</sup> [He] supported the Police measure, on the ground that great delays frequently arose in the search for criminals, for want of a sufficient Police

organization. By this means the friends of the criminals had time to awake sufficient sympathy in their favor to secure their escape.<sup>165</sup>

MR. STEVENSON, in reply to several gentlemen who had spoke on the subject of Separate Schools, contended that no hardship is inflicted on the community by the existing statute. He conceived it to be very unlikely that any separate school would be desired or established under that statute in a school section where there is already a Roman Catholic Teacher.<sup>166</sup>

MR. HARTMAN.--That is the law.<sup>167</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--It is a distinction without a difference. It is true it is the law; but in its practical working, the law in that respect receives no attention. He wished, however, to call particular attention to the difference between the old and the new statutes; under the old act, parties forming a separate school were entitled to a share of the taxation levied for school purposes; under the new act, they are obliged to support the separate schools themselves, being merely entitled to that portion of the tax which they themselves pay.<sup>168</sup>

MR. HARTMAN.--And that was the act of 1[8]53 also.<sup>169</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--No, not in rural places; only in cities and towns. The natural consequences (sic) is that the Separate School Act is not a very great boon in the Roman Catholics, as could be shown by the very small number of instances in which they availed themselves of it. The greatest number of Separate Schools existing at any one time, were established he believed in 1851--since that time the number decreased, so that probably there are not now more than a couple of dozen altogether. In his own country there was one. The Separate School Act he would be glad to see done away with altogether, as he would be glad to see the children of Roman Catholics educated in his own way, and Roman Catholics going to his church rather than to their own; but if they would not do so, if they persisted in retaining their own views, and refused to educate their children, except according to their own notions, then he would prefer seeing them so educated rather than not have them educated at all.--(hear.)<sup>170</sup>

DR. MASSON then rose to move an adjournment. He said that the hour was late, he had a long speech to deliver, and he did not wish to weary the house.<sup>171</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB agreed that it was expedient to adjourn the debate till Monday.<sup>172</sup> He saw it would be impossible to finish it that night.<sup>173</sup>

This proposition was resisted by MESSRS. HOLTON, J.S. MACDONALD, and BROWN who stated their anxiety to finish the debate<sup>174</sup>. The opposition had been taunted with wasting the time of the house and the country. Many had refrained from speaking in order not to do so, and the country should know that the motion to prolong the debate into next week came from the Treasury benches. The Opposition was ready for a division.<sup>175</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON ridiculed the idea of members opposite pretending an anxiety to save public time, when they have spent four days in preparing an absurd amendment, and when they had occupied so much time since in discussing that amendment--the member for Lambton, more particularly, who had in that manner occupied five hours and a half at an expense of 300L to the country.<sup>176</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER gave explanations relative to a statement in reference to the educational status of pupils in Upper Canada Grammar Schools.<sup>177</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON was then proceeding to debate the amendment, but gave way to a generally expressed desire for an adjournment.<sup>178</sup>

The House then adjourned till Monday.<sup>179</sup>

(40)

*On motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*Ordered, That the further Debate be adjourned until Monday next.*

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,*

*The House adjourned until Monday next.<sup>180</sup>*

[DEBATE RE: REPORTERS IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.]

MR. LORANGER called attention to the fact, that in the places where the reporters were now situated, reporting was almost impossible from the difficulty of hearing. He had himself gone up to the gallery, and found that such was the case. He thought it might be well to try if they could not be accommodated near the Speaker.<sup>181</sup>

MR. BROWN expressed his concurrence in what had fallen from the hon. member for Laprairie. It was a very important matter to have the Debates correctly reported, but at present it was useless to expect it. He did not see why, as in Congress, desks should not be placed on the floor of the House, one for each reporting staff, where each reporter might take his notes, and then retire, and give place to another. He believed four such desks would be sufficient. As it was now, an accurate report could not be looked for. He understood that it was almost impossible last night for the reporters to hear the speeches of the Attorney General West and the Inspector General, who spoke from seats directly below the Reporters' Gallery.<sup>182</sup>

MR. A. DORION, (Montreal), made some remarks on the same subject, concurring in the views of the previous speakers.<sup>183</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said that the reporters in the House of Commons had a gallery over the Speaker's chair, and he had never seen them on the floor of the House.<sup>184</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Such is the case in Congress.<sup>185</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB continued, that he agreed it was of importance to have the debates correctly reported, and the matter might be arranged by members having a conversation upon it among themselves.<sup>186</sup>

MR. BROWN [suggested] that a committee should be formed to take the matter into consideration.<sup>187</sup>

The subject then dropped.<sup>188</sup>

[DISCUSSION RE: ORANGEMEN AND PLACARDS IN TORONTO.]

MR. BOWES ... stood up and said he would ask the ear of the House for a moment while he referred to a placard which had been extensively circulated throughout the City of Toronto, last evening. And he did so in consequence of that placard having been brought into the House by one of the members for Lower Canada. He had heard it stated that this placard had emanated from the Orangemen. But since he had entered that House he had a second placard put into his hand, which was issued by the Orangemen and signed by their Grand Master, distinctly repudiating the placard before referred to. From the first he felt convinced that that placard had not been issued by Orangemen; and on seeing it, he at once repudiated it on their behalf. And now he wished to state it as his firm conviction that this placard had been got up for the purpose of injuring the Orange order, the members of which were to hold a Soiree in the city this evening.<sup>189</sup> Others were of opinion that it had been got up by parties interested in the Seat of Government being removed from Toronto. He did not believe,

however, that at least any member of this House could be guilty of so contemptible a trick.<sup>190</sup> The hon. gentleman then read the placard, as follows:--

ORANGEMEN!

THE LOYAL ORANGEMEN

Desire emphatically to repudiate any knowledge of, or connexion with, the INCENDIARY PLACARD, which appeared this morning, headed

A "LEVEE,"

And in which the name of Orangemen has been most unjustifiably and unwarrantably used. Orangemen! we need hardly caution you to

BEWARE!

To not be misled or deceived by such contrivances of your insidious enemies.

OGLE R. GOWAN, Grand Master.

RICHARD DEMPSEY, Senr. Dy. G.M.

GEO. BROCK ROUSSEAU, Jr. Dy. G.M.

He believed that those who got out the placard headed a "Levee" were not only the enemies of Orangeism; but the enemies of the Roman Catholics of Toronto. They had for political purposes, no doubt, sent out this placard. And were of those who so industriously tried to foster religious disputes amongst the people of Canada. He trusted, therefore, that this repudiation would be circulated from one end of the Province to the other, in order that the leaders of the Protestant as well as Roman Catholic party, might be aware of those politicians who, for their own ends, were endeavoring to sow dissension among the people of Canada.<sup>191</sup> He was no Orangeman himself, but<sup>192</sup> he was a friend of the Orangemen, and he was also a friend of his Roman Catholic brethren, both in Upper and Lower Canada. And for years he had striven to unite both parties, and he felt deeply pained to see in this instance another attempt to throw the apple of religious discord among the people of Upper and Lower Canada. Those enemies of progress would have it appear that the act had been done by Orangemen. But he distinctly denied such an imputation. He would guarantee the most ample protection to every man in Lower Canada--as far as every Protestant and every Orangeman in Upper Canada was concerned. So far, they were as safe in Upper Canada, as if they were surrounded by the cannon[s] on the ramparts of Quebec. He would only say, in conclusion that this placard would be sent forth this evening, and he trusted that the gentleman referred to in the other placard, would not consider it worth his notice, or that it had emanated from any Orangeman in Toronto. He hoped the placard would be viewed, as it was perhaps intended, merely as a humbug.<sup>193</sup>

The placard referred to by the hon. member, read as follows:--

A LEVEE

The Hon. Charles Wilson, member of the Legislative Council, and late Mayor of Montreal, who murdered nine Protestants by ordering them to be fired at on the 9th June, 1853, and for which service he received from the Pope the Order of Saint Gregory.

He was honored by entertaining Bedini, the Nuncio of the Pope and the murderer of Hugo Bassi, the Italian Patriot, and for which glorious feat of butchery he was unceremoniously kicked out of the United States.

PROTESTANTS AND ORANGEMEN:

Are expected to attend Mr. Wilson's Levee, and do him all merited homage.

O'Farrall, the defender of the Corrigan murderers, and the Gavazzi rioters expected in a few days.<sup>194</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said it was to the credit of the Orangemen of Toronto that they had repudiated the scandalous placard; he could say that there were very few of them who were capable of having had connection with such a document. (Hear, hear.) It must have been the production of some man desirous (sic) of stirring up a bad feeling between Catholics and Protestants. He was sure that the parties named in it had nothing to fear, and perhaps it was making too much of it, to have mentioned it here at all. (Hear, hear.) There was no respectable man in Toronto who would so disgrace the city to which he belonged, as to take hand or part in such a thing. (Hear, hear.)<sup>195</sup>

MR. LORANGER said that the placard ought to teach hon. gentlemen the propriety of using reserved terms in this House, when they spoke of religious matters. He considered there was no doubt that certain speeches delivered in this House were, if not the direct, yet the indirect cause of that placard.<sup>196</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 22 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
2. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
3. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
4. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
5. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856.
6. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
7. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
8. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
9. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
10. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
11. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
12. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
14. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
15. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
16. IBID.
17. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
18. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
19. IBID.
20. IBID.
21. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
22. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
23. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
24. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
25. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
26. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
30. IBID.
31. IBID.
32. IBID.
33. IBID.
34. IBID.
35. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
36. IBID.
37. IBID.
38. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
39. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
40. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856, comments on Mr. Loranger's speech as follows: "Vint ensuite M. Loranger qui parla pendant plus de deux heures pour prouver à la chambre que l'opposition était incapable de former un gouvernement, parce que les membres qui la composent sont divisés entre eux sur plusieurs questions."
41. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
42. IBID.
43. IBID.
44. IBID.
45. IBID.
46. IBID.
47. IBID.

48. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
49. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856. The last set of ellipsis is replicated as per this newspaper.
50. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856.
51. IBID.
52. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
53. LE PAYS, 28 February 1856.
54. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
55. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
56. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. LA MINERVE, 1 March 1856, reports that Mr. Foley spoke for over one hour.
57. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
58. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
59. IBID.
60. IBID.
61. IBID.
62. IBID.
63. IBID.
64. IBID.
65. IBID.
66. IBID.
67. IBID.
68. IBID.
69. IBID.
70. IBID.
71. IBID.
72. IBID.
73. IBID.
74. IBID.
75. IBID.
76. IBID.
77. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
78. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
79. IBID.
80. IBID.
81. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
82. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. The ellipsis represents illegible words.
83. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
84. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
85. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
86. IBID.
87. IBID.
88. IBID.
89. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
90. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
91. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
92. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
93. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
94. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
95. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
96. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
97. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
98. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.

99. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
100. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
101. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
102. IBID.
103. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, provides additional remarks on Mr. Mackenzie's intended speech: "Mr. Mackenzie stated that he had procured the Quebec Gazette for 1849, with Sir Allan's speech of Feb. 13, copied from the excellent report of the Montreal Herald, and never since questioned by Sir Allan, tho' republished on both continents; and that as Sir A. had accused him of misrepresentation, he would, with his permission, repeat his (Sir A.'s) own words, Sir Allan loudly objected, and saluted Mr. M. with opprobrious remarks.

"Here are the passages referred to:

'He (Sir Allan,) did not make the statement rashly; he knew the people of Upper Canada as well as any man: and he would tell them that there was an opinion gaining ground rapidly in Upper Canada, that by the truckling of their representatives, they were placed under the dominion of FRENCH MASTERS. They were convinced of that fact from the submission of the Upper Canadian Reformers in the House to FRENCH INFLUENCE, when that influence was adverse to the interests of the people they were sent to represent. It so happened that the Union had completely failed in its object. It had been intended for the purpose of reducing the Lower Canadians to the domination of the British Canadians (hear, hear,) and the very contrary effect had been brought about.... That party (Upper Canada) whom it was intended to benefit were reduced to be SERFS OF THE OTHER.'"

'He (Sir Allan MacNab) warned the Ministry (Messrs. Baldwin, Morin, Tache &c.) that the course they were taking was likely to drive the people of Upper Canada to desperation, and to make them feel thankful that if they were to be ruled by foreigners (hear, hear,) it would be more for their benefit to be ruled by a neighboring and kindred people, (meaning the United States,) than by those with whom they had no alliance, either in blood, language, or interest, (meaning the French Canadian Catholics.)' "

104. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
105. IBID.
106. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856. GLOBE, 3 March 1856, reports the following comment regarding Mr. MacNab's reply to Mr. Foley: "Sir Allan twitted Mr. Foley with his comparatively recent appearance in the Legislature, and wished the public to draw the absurd (sic) conclusion that he could not be informed upon the matters of which he spoke. But the Premier seemed to be unaware that the member for North Waterloo had been long connected with politics in the county of Simcoe, and, as editor of the Brant Herald, had acquired a very considerable political status before he solicited the suffrages of the people of Waterloo."
107. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
108. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
109. IBID.
110. IBID.
111. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
112. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
113. IBID.
114. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
115. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
116. IBID.

117. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
118. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
119. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
120. IBID.
121. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
122. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
123. IBID.
124. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
125. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
126. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
127. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
128. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
129. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
130. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
131. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
132. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856.
133. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
134. IBID.
135. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
136. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
137. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
138. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
139. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
140. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
141. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
142. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
143. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
144. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
145. IBID.
146. IBID.
147. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. The first set of ellipsis represents an illegible speaker's name, and the second set represents illegible words.
148. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
149. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
150. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
151. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
152. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
153. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
154. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
155. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
156. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
157. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
158. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 25 February 1856.
159. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
160. IBID.
161. IBID.
162. IBID.
163. IBID.
164. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
165. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
166. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
167. IBID.
168. IBID.

169. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
170. IBID.
171. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856. Several newspapers attribute the motion of adjournment to Mr. A. MacNab.
172. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
173. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
174. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
175. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856. Although this newspaper reports that "Mr. Holton and Mr. Brown opposed the adjournment", it does not clearly attribute this speech to either one member or the other.
176. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
177. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
178. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
179. MORNING CHRONICLE, 28 February 1856.
180. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856, reports "the House adjourned at a quarter past eleven, P.M." HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, in a commentary column, states that the discussion on Mr. Brown's amendment "continued up to midnight".
181. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. According to this newspaper, this debate took place after the petitions were presented and read. However, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856, places the debate immediately after the House assembled.
182. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. GLOBE, 20 February 1856, in a commentary, describes the seating arrangements for those "Reporting in the House": "The present accommodations for reporters in the Assembly are exceedingly defective. The galleries are so situated that in no single position can members on both sides of the House be heard, and it is very difficult indeed to understand what is said even on one side. As to seeing, that is impossible, without craning like a timorous fox hunter. The front boards of the galleries have been made as broad as if giants were to sit behind them. Light galleries of iron, set two feet lower than the present, might have answered in the localities now used; but it is useless to talk of them now. There are two places which would suit the reporters well. One is their old seat, in front of the strangers' gallery; the other is on the floor of the House, near the Speaker's chair. In the latter place, it would only be necessary to find space for one member of each corps, say four seats. Other members of the press, to whom the accurate reporting of every word is not necessary, might occupy the present galleries. We beg to call the serious attention of the members to the subject. If they desire to be well reported, they must put the short-hand writers in a good place."
183. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
184. IBID.
185. IBID.
186. IBID.
187. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
188. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
189. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856. According to this newspaper and to GLOBE, 23 February 1856, this discussion occurred before the debate on the Address.
190. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.
191. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
192. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 23 February 1856.
193. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 23 February 1856.
194. GLOBE, 23 February 1856.

195. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856.

196. GLOBE, 23 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856, provides an account of: "What took place in the House respecting a strong anti-Papist placard which adorned the walls of the city this morning, pointing with vengeance upon Mr. Wilson (the ex-Mayor of Montreal) and Mr. O'Farrell of St. Sylvester not[o]riety. This almost struck consternation into the minds of the French Lower Canadians, who were gathered together about the floor of the House in knots, discussing what was to be done. The Quebec people were told they had made a fine mess of it bringing the seat of Government up here, and Toronto stock in the seat of Government scheme, was decidedly falling. Something, it was felt, must be done. So ere the House met, the counter proclamation ... was issued, and shortly after it came together Mr. Bowes made the explanation.... The affair created the greater stir because it occurred on a day fixed for a great orange demonstration at the St. Lawrence Hall."

MONTREAL GAZETTE, 17 March 1856, reports another placard was posted up in Toronto on March 9, 1856, "to the following effect:--

'John G. Bowes, Esq., deserves the hearty support of all TRUE CATHOLICS. He is now making up his mind to join The True Church: Our priests are entertained at his table; his children are being EDUCATED BY A CATHOLIC LADY; he is the particular friend of the HONBLE. CHARLES WILSON, of glorious memory; he has denounced that apostate Gavazzi in his place in Parliament as a Political Humbug; he is our champion for obtaining a bill FOR SEPARATE SCHOOLS of the right sort, and has promised to introduce and vote for all Catholic measures. Our good Bishop (God bless him) gives him a dispensation to eat meat every day in Lent. Let all true Catholics say -- Hurrah For John G. Bowes.

'St. Michael's Palace.' "

MONDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 1856.

(40)

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House, Returns from the Registrars of the Counties of Simcoe, Wellington, Lennox and Addington, Peterborough and Victoria, Essex, Lanark and Renfrew, pursuant to Act 16 Vic. cap. 187, sec. 9, for the year 1855.

For the said Returns, see Appendix (No. 3.)

And also, Report of the Medical Superintendent, and Bursar's Statement of the Income and Expenditure of the Provincial Lunatic Asylum at Toronto, as required by the Act 15 & 16 Vic. cap. 188.

For the said Report and Statement, see Appendix (No. 4.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of the Reverend J.R. Paré, Curé, of the Parish of St. Jacques, County of Montcalm; the Petition of Peter Skelly and others, of Rawdon and other Townships, County of Montcalm; and the Petition of the Reverend J. Perrault and others, of the Parish of St. Jacques de L'Achigan, County of Montcalm.

By Mr. Gill,--The Petition of the Reverend M. Carrier, Curé and others, School Commissioners of the Parish of St. Antoine de la Baie.

By Mr. Thomas Fortier,--The Petition of the Reverend L.T. Fortier and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of the Parish of St. Jean Baptiste de Nicolet; the Petition of the Reverend Narcisse Pelletier, Curé and others, of the Parish of St. Eusèbe de Stanfold, County of Arthabasha (sic); and the Petition of the Reverend L.T. Fortier and others, of the Parish of St. Jean Baptiste de Nicolet.

By Mr. Brodeur,--The Petition of Sister Jauron, Superior, and others, Sisters of Charity, in charge of the Hotel Dieu Hospital, of St. Hyacinthe.

By Mr. Prévost,--The Petition of the Reverend A. Théberge, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Terrebonne.

By Mr. Somerville,--The Petition of John Leslie and James Leslie, of the Township of Godmanchester.

By Mr. Crawford,--The Petition of the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway Company; the Petition of W.W. Colburn and others, of the Town of Brockville; the Petition of Robert H. Barlow, late of Blackheath, London, England, now of Brantford, in the Province of Canada, on behalf of himself and others; and the Petition of J. Mackirdy and others, holders of Mortgage Bonds of the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway Company.

(41)

By Mr. Church,--The Petition of Daniel Burritt.

By Mr. Patrick,--The Petition of the Town Council of Prescott.

By Mr. Rhodes,--The Petition of William Mountain, of the Town of Sorel; and the Petition of Michael Mernagh, Master-builder and Contractor, of the City of Quebec.

By Mr. Loranger,--The Petition of the Corporation of the Clercs de St. Viateur, of L'Industrie; the Petition of Alfred Faulkenberg, Merchant, of the City of Quebec; and the Petition of the Reverend J.E.D. Depuis, Curé; and of the Reverend A.T. Lacoursière, Vicaire, of the Parish of Ste. Anne de la Pérade, District of Three Rivers.

By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of Peter Carroll and others, of the City of Hamilton.

By Mr. Laporte,--The Petition of the Reverend F.P. Porlier, Curé, and others, Churchwardens and others, of the Parish of Pointe aux Trembles, District of Montreal;

and the Petition of the Reverend F.P. Porlier, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Pointe aux Trembles, District of Montreal.

By Mr. Roblin,--The Petition of E.L. Hurley and others, of the Village of Wilton, County of Addington.

By the Honorable Mr. Lemieux,--The Petition of Norbert Bourassa, Mayor and others, of Point Levi; and the Petition of the College of Notre Dame de la Victoire, County of Levi, District of Quebec.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of David Morgan and others, of the Township of Townsend, County of Norfolk.

By Mr. Frazer,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Wainfleet.

By Mr. Holton,--The Petition of the Bank of Montreal.

By Mr. James Smith,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Emily, County of Victoria; the Petition of Richard Thompson and others, of the Township of Hope; and the Petition of E. Peters and others, of the Township of Hope.

By Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion,--Two Petitions of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of Montreal.

By the Honorable Mr. Young,--The Petition of the Montreal Board of Trade.

By Mr. Chisholm,--The Petition of Ezra Bray and others, inhabitants of School Section, No. 15, Trafalgar, County of Halton.

By Mr. Guévremont,--The Petition of the Library Association and Mechanics' Institute of the Town of Sorel.

By Mr. Alleyn,--The Petition of James Gibb and others, of the City of Quebec; the Petition of the Quebec Protestant Female Orphan Asylum; and the Petition of the Quebec Board of Trade.

By Mr. Charles Daoust,--The Petition of Louis Edouard Pacaud, Advocate, of the Town of Three Rivers.<sup>1</sup>

By Mr. Wilson,--The Petition of the London Mercantile Library Association; and the Petition of John Dodsworth and others, of the City of London, Canada West.

By Mr. Jean Baptiste Daoust,--The Petition of the Reverend J. Gastineau, Curé of St. Eustache, and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of St. Eustache, County of Two Mountains.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of the Honorable Simeon Washburn, of the Town of Picton, County of Prince Edward; praying to be indemnified for the deficiency of fifty-five acres in a lot of land situate on the Bay Quinté, and granted to his father by Letters Patent from the Crown.

(42)

Of Jean Langevin, of the City of Quebec; praying payment of the amount due him as Clerk of the Council of the former Municipal District of Quebec.

Of Louis Beaudoin and others, of the Parish of St. Paul, County of Joliette; praying for certain amendments to the Act 18 Vic., cap. 191, intituled, "An Act for the construction of the Assomption River Railroad Company."

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing Counties to purchase, establish, and regulate Industrial Farms, and erect and maintain thereon Alms Houses, &c., with power to levy assessments on the several Municipalities composing the said County.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying that more adequate means may be adopted for the support and treatment of the Insane.

Of H.J. Noad, President of the Quebec Board of Trade, and others, of the City of Quebec; praying that measures may be taken for the construction of the North Shore Railway between Quebec and Montreal.

Of the Directors of the North Shore Railway Company; praying that a certain tract of land may be granted to them which would enable them to raise the necessary funds for the construction of the said Road.

Of Michael Scott, President, and others, School Commissioners, of the Municipality of the Village of Cap Rouge; praying aid for an Academy in the said Village.

Of the Reverend E. Payment and others, of the Parishes of Beauport and Charlesbourg, County of Quebec; praying that the Road called the "Route Bourg Royal," may be macadamized.

Of the Trustees of the Academy of St. André d'Argenteuil; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend L.A. Bourret, Curé of Ste. Anne, and others, of the Counties of L'Islet and Kamouraska; praying for aid to open a Road from Lake St. John, to join the Quebec and Saguenay Railroad, in rear of Quebec.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying that the 36th section of the Act 16 Vic., cap. 11, may be so amended, that the Directors of the County Societies may hold their annual exhibition at such time and place as a majority of the Directors at their annual meetings may determine.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying that the same duties may at all times have effect upon American Manufactures imported into this Province as are imposed on Canadian Manufactures, when received into the United States, and that the principle of Reciprocity may be established between this Province and the United States with reference to shipping, the registration of vessels, and the coasting trade.

Of the Justices of the Peace for the County of Elgin in Quarter Sessions assembled; praying for the passing of an Act similar to that in force in Lower Canada, for granting to the several Officers connected with the Administration of Justice in the said County, a fixed salary in lieu of fees.

Of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City of Ottawa; praying aid for the Ottawa and Prescott Railway Company.

Of the Municipality of the Township of West Gwillimbury, County of Simcoe; praying for the repeal of the Separate School Act.

Of Thomas Solomon and others, of the Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; of Reverend W.J. Mackenzie and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of William Thackeray and others, of the Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; of S. Vanderburgh and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of Henry Ingersoll and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of Alexander Neill and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of William Brown and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland;

(43)

Township of Alnwick, County of Northumberland; of Hugh Halligan and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of John Orr and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; of Mrs. Dooly and others, of the Town of Cobourg, County of Northumberland; and of John McMillan and others, of the Townships of Tecumseth and Stanley, County of Huron; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Southwold, County of Elgin; praying that a certain Road allowance lying between lots numbers Ten and Forty, Talbot Road East, in the said Township; may be vested in James Taunton.

Of James Taunton, of the Township of Southwold, County of Elgin; praying that a certain portion of the Road allowance lying between lots numbers Ten and Forty; may be vested in him.

Of the Hamilton and Port Dover Railway Company; praying that the time allowed them by their charter for building the said Road, may be extended.

Of Miss Eliza Taylor and others, the Ladies Managers of the Male Protestant Orphan Asylum of Quebec; praying for aid.

Of the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company; praying for the passing of an Act to enable them to increase their capital stock, and to extend their line of Railway to or near Port Colborne, by way of Allenburgh, Port Robinson, and Merrittville, with power also to connect with other lines of Railway, and to employ and own steam or other vessels on Lake Erie, as now secured to them on Lake Ontario.

Of J.P. Boomer and others, of Queenston and St. Catharines; praying for an Act of Incorporation.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington; praying for the passing of an Act to vest in John Farley, the younger, the Road allowance between the north halves of lots numbers Eighteen and Nineteen, in the fifth concession of Darlington.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington; praying for certain amendments to the School Act, 13 & 14 Vic., cap. 48.

Of William P. McLaren and others, of the City of Hamilton; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of "The Ontario Hotel Company."

Of Thomas Chisholm and others, of the Village of Ayr, County of Waterloo; praying for the passing of an Act to enable John Watson to acquire a certain piece of land in the said Village for manufacturing purposes, with power also to construct a water-course across a certain side line or Road.

Of John Watson, of the Village of Ayr, County of Waterloo; praying for the passing of an Act to enable him to acquire a certain piece of land in the said Village for manufacturing purposes, upon payment for the same; and also for power to construct a water-course across a certain side line or Road.

On motion of MR. MUNRO,<sup>2</sup>

(43)

Ordered, That the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington, relative to vesting a road allowance in John Farley, and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington, relative to the School Act, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Smith, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Spence,  
Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read;

And the Order of the day being read, for resuming the adjourned Debate upon the Amendment, which was on Thursday last, proposed to be made to the third paragraph of the Question, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech from the Throne at the

(44)

opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime, and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law, and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since their last meeting nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid

(45)

before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing the Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs' Duties which were made by Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts, consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic, we have however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:

That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:

That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will

(46)

rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event;

And which Amendment was, That the words, "this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves," be left out of the said paragraph, and the words "it would have afforded this House sincere gratification had we been enabled to congratulate His Excellency on the final and equitable settlement of the long disputed question of the Clergy Reserves; but it is our duty to state that the Act of last Session has not effected

*the avowed object for which it was framed, but, on the contrary, has permanently endowed certain favored Churches with large sums of the Public money," inserted instead thereof;*

*And the Question on the Amendment being again proposed; the House resumed the said adjourned Debate.*<sup>3</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE took the floor.<sup>4</sup> The Hon. ... [gentleman] said I can not let the amendment pass without saying a few words on this subject. I did not intend to have addressed the House at this period, as I expected the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands would have been in his place to address the House at the opening of the debate this afternoon. I must say in reference to the amendment that it does not in the least surprise me that the member for Lambton has expressed dissatisfaction with the final settlement of the Clergy Reserves question because the course pursued by that hon. member for some years past, with reference to the Reform party showed, that true to his instinct, he would be found opposed to the settlement of that question. It does not at all surprise me that the hon. member for Lambton should do so, nor would it surprise the country. But it does surprise me that the hon. gentleman should have given<sup>5</sup> no reasons for opposing that settlement, when he felt it his duty to take the extraordinary course of declaring in his amendment that it was not satisfactory to the country. It might have been expected, after nine months of incessant agitation, so far as agitation could be produced through the columns of<sup>6</sup> the Globe,<sup>7</sup> the paper edited and published by the hon. gentleman--it might have been expected that some direct charges would have been brought, either as to the Government policy of settling the question, or as to the mode in which the Government had settled one of its most important clauses.<sup>8</sup> And I can safely say that the country will feel astonished at the course pursued by the hon. member for Lambton, in taking up the time of the House, on Thursday evening<sup>9</sup>. In the whole of the hon. member's speech not the slightest pretence of an argument was to be found against either the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question by the legislature at Quebec, or against the manner in which they had carried out the commutation clause.<sup>10</sup> The hon. member for Lambton enjoyed his privilege of saying whatever he may freely against the Administration. In the five hours speech to which we listened the other evening, he spoke of their policy, their measures, their want of agreement on their present policy, and their future course, but precious little did he say respecting the Clergy Reserve Bill, further than that it did not meet his approbation. I do not know what would meet his (*sic*) approbation of the hon. member for Lambton, he has for a considerable length of time been the open and avowed opponent of the Reform party in this country. If proof of this fact were required I would take the Reform members on my right hand and on my left, and round about, and they would proclaim that he was the greatest enemy the Reform party ever had in this country. (Hear, hear). I therefore, am not surprised that at the last moment after a 40 years' agitation the hon. member should have been found consistent in opposing the settlement of the question. I think it extraordinary that he should have affected to treat this subject as one of slight importance, that he should not have considered it his duty to take advantage of the favorable circumstances which combined in 1854 to settle this difficulty, that he should have forgotten the previous history of that question. He seems to have forgotten that the Reformers of this country had endeavored for years to settle this question, but had never found an opportunity of doing so. I say it is not just, it is not honest, it is not fair to hon. members who had the settlement of this question, that the hon. gentleman should have affected to treat it as one of the simplest propositions which could be offered to this house--that there would be no more difficulties surrounding that question than there would be in the naturalization of an individual or the chartering of a

Bank, or any other ordinary measure. He knows this was the great question of the country. What the Reform Bill was in England, or the Seigniorial Tenure Bill was in Lower Canada, the Clergy Reserves was with us. Lands were becoming of more value, and public opinion was divided as to the best means of settling this question. It is a fact that a united opinion in reference to the Reserves was never got in any two consecutive Parliaments, and this shows that it was a subject of great difficulty. It is a fact that from 1823 or 24, when this question came under consideration in the Assembly public opinion always fluctuated in reference to the manner of its<sup>11</sup> settlement. This was sufficient to prove that it was one of no simple solution.<sup>12</sup> If the Church of Scotland had not pressed her claims about this time, the Clergy Reserve question might have been kept from public discussion for many years after. But about that time, we learn the Church of Scotland put in her claim. At that time the lands were valueless, not yielding more than about 200L a year. And what was the question proposed? Did it involve the question of a State Church; or the voluntary principle, or the division principle. None of these. It was presented to the country as a great social evil, inasmuch as large blocks of land were kept unoccupied in the country, to the hindrance of settlement<sup>13</sup>. The first application then was, to have these lands sold. The next application made to a Liberal Parliament was that the lands should be sold and<sup>14</sup> the proceeds [divided] among all sects. And public opinion continued to fluctuate as to what should be done. I say there never was a question raised in Canada that caused so much excitement in the manner of adjustment as these Clergy Reserves. It was doing injustice to the good sense of the people of Canada to make it appear now that this was one of the simplest propositions to be offered to Parliament when, on the contrary, we know that in that one question has been involved the religious prejudices of vast numbers of persons, and we have not had in two consecutive parliaments a uniformity of opinion as to the best way of treating the question. We find that from 1823 or 24 up to 1840 the opinion of the people changed frequently upon that subject. The first attempt was that the lands should be sold and the money devoted amongst all Christian bodies. Another attempt was to divide the money amongst all Christian bodies giving a portion for education<sup>15</sup>; if he remembered rightly,<sup>16</sup> another was to devote the proceeds entirely to education, and finally to education and the erection of places of public worship. I want to show the House that this question, which was supposed by the honorable member for Lambton to be so easy of solution brought this country to the verge--I was going to say of revolution. Such is the testimony of some of the ablest men who ever examined the subject. It was the opinion of Sir George Arthur--it was the opinion of the enlightened Lord Sydenham--it was the opinion of Mr. Baldwin, and Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, declared that the question--now treated so lightly by the honorable member for Lambton--one in the settlement of which he cares so little--brought Canada into a state of rebellion<sup>17</sup> [OR] produced the rebellion of 1837-1838.<sup>18</sup> That it retarded its progress--deranged its finances--injured its credit--and threw it back--how many years I cannot tell. But the honorable member for Lambton cared for none of these things; he would have let it go 40 years more unsettled, until he should have had his own peculiar opinions brought to bear in settling it.<sup>19</sup> He (Mr. Spence) did not hesitate to say that his opinions as to the right mode of settling the question would not have been different from those of the hon. member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.) He was as great a voluntary as the member for Lambton, but he would not pursue the course which that hon. gentleman had done.<sup>20</sup> After having supported the very proposition which had acceptance in this House and with the country, and when he found that we were likely to settle this question he was determined that this last measure of the Reform party should be retained for his own selfish purposes. This is no question in which a man has a just right to obtrude his own individual

opinions--it was not a question in which a man had a right to say that because he was a voluntary he would do his utmost to prevent its settlement unless in the way he chose to dictate.<sup>21</sup> The hon. gentleman was a voluntary, but he was not on that account to<sup>22</sup> pertinaciously bring in these opinions, and endeavor to cram them down the throats of all other persons<sup>23</sup> [and] put an insuperable difficulty in the way of the settlement of a question which had done more harm to this country, than all others put together. And, in attempting to do so, the hon'ble. gentleman proved that he was no patriot, no lover of his country, no friend to peace and order.<sup>24</sup>

Ministerial cheers.<sup>25</sup>

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE continued:] But after having supported factiously the very principle which finally became law, we find this honorable gentleman opposing the most important question that ever agitated the country, and which beyond all other questions affected its best interests. There are many questions of great magnitude, but they have their limits in their effects on the community at large. But this must have effected every thinking man--every religious body, every public man throughout the Province. There was no man, no homestead, safe from agitation on this question. Therefore, I say that it was a subject of surpassing magnitude, and should not have been treated by the hon. member for Lambton in the light he effects to regard it, as one, which all men could agree upon, as one which could be settled by his own mere dictum. It should not have been treated so.<sup>26</sup> The House was told about there being a harmony and unity of opinion among the people of Canada on this question, and that it only required a wise government and an honest Legislature to settle it. An examination of its history, however, had led him (Mr. S.) to a different conclusion. In 1840 it was supposed to be settled, on the footing of a grand division scheme among the churches<sup>27</sup> of England and Scotland. That was the mode which was supposed best at the time. A bill was passed and sent to England.<sup>28</sup> That bill was passed in defiance of the opinions of ten of the judges of England, and by the English Parliament another law was passed, which was in operation for four years. He would have agreed with the member for Lambton and others in disturbing that settlement because he thought the people of Canada having been invited to legislate upon it, they were the parties by whom it should have been settled. In 1844 an attempt was made to take the unappropriated lands and give them to the religious denominations, and that was the origin of the agitation which had gone on from that time till the present.<sup>29</sup> In 1848, I think, the Reform party in its greatest strength assumed the government of this country. What I want to impress upon the House is, that Reformers themselves were not agreed upon the manner of settling this question in consequence of the difficulties by which it was surrounded. In 1848 nothing was done by the Reform party towards a settlement. In 1849 another Session passed over and nothing was done, yet the hon. member for Lambton makes you believe it was the easiest thing in the world to settle this difficulty. In 1850 the hon. Mr. Price introduced a series of resolutions<sup>30</sup>, not as a Minister, but as a private member,<sup>31</sup> with a view to equitable adjustment, or the introduction of these resolutions. The hon. Mr. Boulton asked if they had the sanction of Government. Mr. Price said they had not. The answer was that the Reform Government was not united on the settlement of this question. And who was their most powerful supporter at that time--was it not the hon. member for Lambton. Did he hesitate to support them, because they were not united upon this question. Not at all. It was not necessary in his estimation that the Government should be united upon Clergy Reserves. Mr. Baldwin acknowledged that the Government could not unite upon it and the alternative was that they resolved if the resolutions were brought into the House they should be brought upon the individual responsibility of one of the

members. What was the strength of the Government at that time? They had a large majority of the House supporting them and a very large majority of the people of the country. The Reform Government then was stronger than perhaps will ever be formed again in the country, and yet they had to acknowledge their weakness in this great question. When it came to the vote the principal resolution was carried only by a majority of two. And yet the hon. member for Lambton tells us there were no difficulties connected with the settlement of this question.<sup>32</sup> It has been surrounded, sir, with difficulties.--Yet, notwithstanding these difficulties, notwithstanding the fact that the lands were becoming immensely valuable, and that the men who were drawing their allowances from them were year after year pressing a stronger claim for their allowances, the honorable member for Lambton would still see this kept an open question. (Hear, hear.) He would see the ablest men which the country ever produced, one after another, shuffled off the board until he should have an opportunity of coming in to take their position. (Hear, hear.) Well, these resolutions were carried.--Allusion was made at home to the important fact that strong as the party felt themselves to be the principal resolution was carried only by a majority of two, and when I see the Attorney General East here in his place, Roman Catholic as he is--French Canadian as he is called, and priest ridden as he may be, I as an Upper Canadian Protestant reformer, am not ashamed of the sentiments uttered by the Attorney General East upon that occasion. He recognized the principle of settling this question, and did his best to effect it. In 1851, however, the short cut was discovered. It was proposed to settle this question by bill. Did the honorable member for Lambton support that Government? He did so, and a bill was not then the proper way.<sup>33</sup> [OR] That was opposed by the member for Lambton as unconstitutional.<sup>34</sup> It would be, he said, a Republican course, and he would have nothing that was not Monarchical.<sup>35</sup> The hon. member supported that government step by step in 1851 until a very important period. Until the Haldimand election he was the steady supporter of the Administration. The hon. member for Haldimand, at a meeting held in the town of Dundas, declared that the hon. member for Lambton, while contesting that election in Haldimand, declared that "he had the confidence of the Government and the Government had his confidence." He then supported the Government and especially their policy on this question.<sup>36</sup> Just then a dispute arose as to the payment of the expenses of the election<sup>37</sup>. I ask the hon. member for Lambton if it was not exceedingly singular that he should have just discovered the proper course of independence, in opposing that Administration when it was disputed how the expenses of a certain election should be paid. At that time ... he discovered there were no more Penitentiary Commissions to be given to him. Well, sir, in the fall of that year, there was an election, and the member for Lambton prepared himself for the contest. I have endeavored to describe the magnitude of this question. I have endeavored to show that in the best times of the Reform party they were divided in council upon this question, and unable to agree upon a plan which would be at all likely to meet the views of the country at large.--One would have supposed that a gentleman, who says he is a reformer, would have put himself in league with his friends, and given his great talents and his best exertions and the influence of his press for the strengthening and consolidation of his party, and would have gone to the polls, and helped to get his friends returned in order that this question should be settled. What was the course pursued by the hon. member for Lambton? The Administration at that time was re-constructed. Hon. gentlemen, well known reformers were taken into the Government--the hon. member for Norfolk, and the hon. Malcolm Cameron--yet the hon. member for Lambton was not satisfied with them. He declared he would pursue a course of opposition, and he did so. Reckless of the consequences--although it was considered by every reformer that the course he pursued was most dangerous to his party. I will take the opinion of the liberals of this House--I don't take the

conservative opinion--but would ask my liberal friends, in whom had the member for Lambton confidence at that time? He had none in Mr. Baldwin--none in Mr. Price--none in Mr. Lafontaine--none in Mr. Drummond--none in Mr. Cameron--none in Mr. Hincks--and he had not the slightest confidence in the hon. member for Norfolk. He abused him--he scandalized him. He was "dissolving views," and, in fact, I would be ashamed to repeat the words he used in reference to that "venerable" gentlemen (sic), who had laboured year after year for the settlement of this question. He seemed to ask the Reformers to stand back, until he should have an opportunity of settling it. Was that right? Was it just?--Was it true to his party? Let those honble. gentlemen answer. The elections came on, and through his exertions not fewer than five liberal constituencies were lost to the liberal party at that election. In that election, when his exertions might have been of immense value to Reformers, he became a traitor to his party.<sup>38</sup> He denounced and drove out the best and most worthy members of the Reform party.<sup>39</sup> Take the Hon. Mr. Baldwin, and I am sure whether amongst Reformers or Conservatives, his name will always be held in the highest respect; yet he was denounced by the hon. member for Lambton, when he had no more interest in the Government. Hon. Mr. Hincks was denounced. Hon. Mr. Cameron was denounced, and every one else who adhered to the Administration. The result of that election, as I have already said, was that five constituencies<sup>40</sup> were lost to the Reform cause<sup>41</sup>, and yet the hon. member for Lambton says there was no difficulty settling this question, although it was one of the most prominent before the country. But how could they settle this question when they have lost cataline in their ranks--public opinion was taken aback. They staggered wherever that perfidy on the Clergy Reserve question was applied to Malcolm Cameron, or that Dr. Rolph, whose speech upon that subject, in 1836, was the admiration of every Reformer, should have been suspected of deception in regard to the settlement of this question. In fact, the country was taken by surprise. Time rolled on.<sup>42</sup> In 1852, at the latter part of the session, the Imperial Government, notwithstanding that Lord Derby had become its head, advised Lord Elgin, that a bill would be submitted to the English Parliament, enabling the Parliament of Canada to settle this question. Did that give satisfaction to the member for Lambton? Did it arrest him in his mad course? Did it give him one fresh drop of patriotism? Not in the slightest, but onward he went in his maddened course. (Oh! oh!)<sup>43</sup> He denounced right and left the ablest men in the party, and he denounced the whole thing as a humbug. In 1854, when the Legislature met, and when the whole subject was in the hands of the Government; when the Imperial Parliament had passed a bill giving power to legislate, and when the Cabinet was united upon this question, the first time a Cabinet had ever announced that it was united upon that question;--where was the hon. member for Lambton? Was he amongst the reformers desirous to get this question settled? Was he not amongst their opponents? And who was denounced by him at that time? Every gentleman who supported the administration. Were not many of those hon. gentlemen now in the ranks of the Opposition denounced by the hon. member for Lambton. In 1854, as I have stated, we had a united government--united upon the settlement of this question, without any difficulty or fear of obstruction at home, without any fear of what is fashionably termed the priest-ridden party of Lower Canada, without any fear of backstairs influence. In fact there was nothing to fear. Where was the member for Lambton? In the opposition. Still determined to keep the question one of the great subjects to agitate the country, and determined to assist most powerfully in breaking up the administration of the day. The next we find of that gentleman is in his relation to the present government. This government was formed shortly after he had succeeded in breaking up the previous administaation (sic). Did he then begin to feel that he had made a mistake, that he had erred in losing an opportunity in settling this difficulty. The previous government had printed their bill, and he

had it for days, and weeks, and months in his possession. But that bill did not suit him, and no bill would suit him, any more than would any man or any administration that could be formed, until an opportunity would be afforded him of leading the Ministry himself, or until some increased abuses might make it desirable to institute a government enquiry, or until some penitentiary commissionerships should be required, (hear, hear.) I cannot help alluding to the general election of 1854, and I might produce a whole stack of newspapers, and any quantity of books and (sic) pamphlets, to show that the hon. member for Lambton assiduously applied himself<sup>44</sup> to the cultivation of an excellent friendship with the gentlemen called Tories or Conservatives<sup>45</sup>. Yet the hon. gentleman calls himself a reformer, the only true reformer in the house. Nor does any gentleman know the three members who will rise up as joints in the tail of the hon. member for Lambton. He is the only honest man in the country. Old men who have grown grey in the party, and who have all along taken a course they heartily believe will lead to a more satisfactory conclusion<sup>46</sup>. And at that election, was he found working on behalf of the member for Victoria, (Mr. James Smith), the member for Grenville, (Mr. Patrick), the member for Lennox and Addington, (Mr. Roblin), with the member for Oxford, (Dr. Ephraim Cook), with the member for Middlesex, (Mr. Matheson), or with the other old Reformers of the country? No!<sup>47</sup> Old reformers who have all along contended for the settlement of this question were denounced, while<sup>48</sup> he was exhibiting his Reform qualities by caballing with the open and honest, conscientious opponents of the Clergy Reserves, men who had never changed their views--caballing with them to form a moderate Reform Conservative Government.<sup>49</sup> The honorable member for Hamilton owes him a debt of gratitude for his services<sup>50</sup>. It was notorious that the hon. gentleman [Mr. Brown] lent his best exertions to secure the return of Sir Allan McNab for Hamilton, rather than Mr. Isaac Buchanan, and on this very question of the Clergy Reserves.<sup>51</sup> Sir Allan MacNab, he declared, to be perfectly sound on the Reserves question. At the right time, he said he would perfectly suit Mr. Brown. He did not suit that gentleman now, and why, because he was not his colleague; because Sir Allan sent no work to his shop, or because there was no further Penitentiary business to regulate.<sup>52</sup> My honorable colleague, Mr. Cayley, owes him his hearty thanks, for his support at the last election<sup>53</sup> against Mr. McQueen.<sup>54</sup> Was not Mr. Macqueen, one of our most liberal men, denounced by the honorable member for Lambton? Did he not help these constituencies to return tories rather than reformers? Did he stop there? Was there not a little to be done at Kingston?<sup>55</sup> And there was to be a little done in Renfrew too. At that time the present Attorney General (Hon. J.A. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Lambton, had a most agreeable acquaintance, and he fancied the Attorney General was rather under obligations to that hon. gentleman for his having been returned to Kingston, in opposition to Mr. Counter. But he went further, and promised his hon. friend, that if he would stand for Renfrew, he would have his support against Mr. Hincks. He actually volunteered his services to go up the Ottawa, and return Mr. Macdonald for Renfrew against the leader of the Reform Administration, that he might enter Parliament in the two-fold capacity of member for Kingston and member for Renfrew.<sup>56</sup> And he still continues to humbug the people of this country by making them believe that he is the only true Reformer, that all others, are but striplings of renegades, and have sold their principles. What is his position now? Count his friends around him. They are all in opposition it is true, but how many of them agree with the honorable member for Lambton? Must it not be galling for them to find that they have been betrayed.<sup>57</sup> Was it not melancholy that the hon. gentleman (sic) opposite who used to be led by the Government of Hincks, Rolph, and Cameron, that they should now be in Opposition, and supporting the hon. gentleman, who of all others that ever took part in public affairs in this country, was the greatest enemy of Reform principles. (Oh! oh!<sup>58</sup> Hear hear.) In

1854 the honorable member for Lambton was a little discouraged at finding there was a coalition government; although it was composed of the very individuals whom he assisted to the utmost in being returned. It was very strange that Sir Allan Macnab was recommended to the staunch reformers of Hamilton, because he was a better secularizer than the Free Church voluntary Mr. Buchanan. It was a reform constituency, and a reform administrator had promised to secularize the Reserves, but this did not satisfy the hon. member [for] Lambton; he must have tories to do so. And now he is not satisfied with playing out his own game (hear, hear); he is not satisfied with the result of his own machinations (hear, hear); he was not satisfied with the bill of the old administration; he is not satisfied with the bill of the present administration; and yet it is remarkable that these bills are very much alike. All the distinguished men of the reform party who from time to time have attempted to bring up this question agreed in this that the rights of those who had existing claims upon the Clergy Reserve funds should be respected. The con. (sic) member for Lambton never denied that principle. He recognized the propriety of this in the resolutions which passed the House, at the time when he was a firm supporter of the Administration, one of which stated expressly that the claims of those who were at that time stipendiaries should be regarded in the most liberal spirit. The same was provided in the Bill [of] 1854. What then was the difficulty in the settlement? None except this, that the hon. member for Lambton had no share in settling it himself. No sooner was the present Administration formed, than he along with other 38 gentlemen, in the most constitutional and statesmanlike manner possible, declared that the Government should be opposed from the beginning. These were the 39 round robinists. Who was it [that] recommended Sir Allan McNab as a secularizationist? Who recommended Mr. Cayley in preference to Mr. Macqueen? The hon. member for Lambton. He did his utmost to support the Tory party, and he imperilled the settlement of the question by declaring positively in every possible way, that there could be no confidence placed in the Administration; and yet when the very men whom he had helped to return, formed the new Administration; he determined to oppose them also from the very commencement. Did he find any precedent for such a course? No matter, whatever, all these gentlemen had just been to their constituents, and had received their approval after joining the Administration. That hon. gentlemen (sic) again perilled this question by declaring that there could be no confidence in this Administration, no matter what their acts. This was not right to the constituencies of Hamilton and Kingston, whose members he had so warmly supported, now to endeavour to destroy confidence which the country desired to place in them. Notwithstanding this opposition, however, the Government was supported. A bill was introduced to settle this question, differing from the previous bills, in so far that it contemplated a settlement of the question for ever. The only proper course open to the hon. member for Lambton, and every hon. member in this House claiming to be a Reformer was to have supported this bill. But, although, he gave it a decided opposition, I have now to say that experience of the past has proved the wisdom of the Government in dealing with this question. (Hear, hear.) In reference to securing the rights of those who were incumbents at the time the Administration drew this bill in such a way as should have recured (sic) the report of every member of the reform party. The most eminent men in the party, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Hincks, Dr. Rolph, and other[s] had recognized that principle but still the bill was opposed. But the difficulty most in the way was the commutation clause. I recollect saying at the time that without that clause I should not consider the bill worth two pence. I say so still. I now reiterate what I then said that if divested of this clause the bill would not, in my estimation, be worth two pence. (Hear, hear.) In 1840 it was considered that the question was finally settled, and so it was until the question of a distribution of the lands was brought up. And so

would it have been again had that question been left open. As one interested in the welfare of the country, I feel that that question could not be beyond discord and vexatious interference unless such a clause as the commutation clause were inserted, and by the operations of which the matter is closed up. If this clause had not been inserted would not the tables of this House year after year be covered with petitions from one end of the Province to the other demanding another disposition of the fund? There could have been no settlement of the question without commutation. I might read the testimony of the most of our Governors, that there could be no peace, no security for intending emigrants, until this question was settled, until some machinery was introduced by which the lands should be put beyond agitation, until ... sold be alienated there could be no reliance of peace to the country.<sup>59</sup> I would just ask what has the country gained by the settlement? The Inspector General, ever cautious, stated that it would take over 400,000L to indemnify the commutants. What is the fact. He told us the other night that not more than 381,000L had been required.--I think, he said, at that time too, that there would be about 100,000L to divide amongst the people, now he tells there are 318,000L<sup>60</sup> [OR] 312,000L<sup>61</sup> for distribution. Nothing further was held out to us; but I think he will not contradict me if I say that there will be 100,000L more to be divided amongst the Municipalities next year, and to this amount may be added a large amount of unsold lands. Will the people of Canada say it was not desirable to have had this question settled. It was so both in a moral and in an economical point of view. I call upon gentlemen to say what better mode could have been adopted to settle this question. I say now that in all the four hours' speech that we heard the other evening from the honorable member from Lambton, it is a remarkable fact that a better way of settling this question was never offered by that gentleman, all that he could say was that the commutation clause was wrong. The bill was, however, passed, and I wish the honorable member for Lambton joy of all the opposition he has raised to it. After the Government had presented their bill and sent it out to the country it is not likely they would have prorogued the house in December twelve month, and given the honorable member for Lambton an opportunity of agitating the country upon this commutation clause, had they not been satisfied, the country would sustain them. He did manage to get a number of petitions sent in, and a great number of names were put to them--I think somewhere about 20,000 signatures, but the fact was that Government was sustained by a larger majority than they ever had before; and I venture to say, that were the country polled from one end to another there would be a vast majority in favor of the Administration. I would ask the grey headed men of the country--men who thoroughly understand the question, and I would ask the stout yeomen of this country, whose first political sentiments had been connected with the Clergy Reserves; I would go through the people, and they would say with one accord, thank God this question is settled.<sup>62</sup> The question, too, has been settled in a business-like manner, without any violation of constitutional law, or abuse of the power vested in the Government<sup>63</sup>, and he defied the member for Lambton to show anything wrong in it. The member for Lambton had taunted members for supporting Government because they got business at the assizes as crown prosecutors, but did those taunts come well from the member for Lambton, who had received more Government pay than any man in the country? He thought not. For nine months that gentleman had amused the public with all sorts of jobs and plots, yet the other night he kept the house four hours without a single allusion to all those jobs<sup>64</sup>. It is a mistake to suppose that the hon. gentleman recommends himself either to the country or to the House by this course of opposition. (Hear, hear.) I think the division on the present motion will show that the supporters of the Administration have not lost their confidence in them; and that they are at least entitled to as much honor as the honorable member for Lambton will be entitled to. The hon. member

for Lambton did not allude to the statements which have been circulated through the Globe in reference to the Macnaughton case. I deny it in toto. The members of that church<sup>65</sup> had a right to the sum they received; they were justly entitled to every farthing.<sup>66</sup> The hon. gentleman [Mr. Spence] here referred to the way in which this case had been brought out and alluded to the Separate School question.<sup>67</sup> He said that the bill of last year was intended only to give effect to and carry out the law of 1847<sup>68</sup>. The Legislature last year had given no new power in regard to separate schools, but had given a straightforward meaning to the act, in order to give those who desire to enjoy separate schools a fair and intelligent meaning of the Act. As regards the policy of the system the hon. member said, I think the best opinion I can give upon the Separate School bill will be from the chest of the Superintendent of Schools. No man will doubt the integrity of Dr. Ryerson, or imagine that he would do anything prejudicial to our Common School System. What did he say? In the Report of 1850, he says that, While successive school acts for the last 10 years have permitted the establishment of Separate Schools, there are only 46 of such schools in Upper Canada. He then states that the cry got up by some people is a groundless one, that there is no danger of the School system being destroyed by permitting these denominations who were enjoying the privilege to establish Separate Schools. Can anything be more conclusive. In 1853<sup>69</sup> [OR] 1852,<sup>70</sup> he writes, it is my deliberate and decided opinion, greatly strengthened by the observation of the last year or two, that the abolition of this provision of the School Law would greatly impede the advancement of the system, and do injury to all parties concerned, and I entreat every friend to the continued and unparalleled prosperity of our School system to abstain from all agitation and opposition against the provision of the School Law for Separate Schools. I think I have quoted the best authority upon this subject<sup>71</sup>, and his testimony was, of course, of the highest importance.<sup>72</sup> Wiseman is better than Dr. Ryerson to give an opinion. No man would more regret it than he if an injury was done by this clause. In my place in Parliament I gave my opinion on this subject during the last session--I am not in favor of Separate Schools, but would prefer a united system; but because I am not in favor of Separate Schools ... [I] desire to continue that clause, and by so doing preserve the School System while it affords a relief to those who rather than send their children to Schools where they imagine violence would be done to their religious opinions, would allow them to go without education.<sup>73</sup> The removal of the clause referred to would only tend to increase the number of Separate Schools. Then as to the working of the Act, there were only 54 Separate Schools in all Upper Canada, of which only 44 belonged to the Roman Catholics. And as many as 15 or 16<sup>74</sup> [OR] most of them have been established in populous cities and towns. In Toronto there are I think seven, and in more than twenty counties in Upper Canada there is not one Separate School.<sup>75</sup> This proves that the clause had not wrought badly.<sup>76</sup> It is a question to consider whether with such results from the operations of the Sectarian School clause, it would be wise to impart our general education measure by repealing this clause, and take our chance of the consequences. I say that while the establishment of Sectarian Schools has been so limited--the number being so very small compared with the general schools in the Province, it is better to leave things as they are--it is better to continue that security to those who may be dispoed (sic) to take advantage of it amongst the Roman Catholics, Jews, and colored persons. If the House would just reflect that out of over 3,000 schools now in Upper Canada, there are only 54 Separate Sahoools (sic), 44 of which belong to the Roman Catholic Church. I think the Government will receive credit for the course they have taken on this subject.<sup>77</sup> [It] was bound not only to maintain the separate school law, but to see that it had a fair and liberal interpretation.<sup>78</sup> This much I say, that

notwithstanding the opposition which has been given the Government--notwithstanding the apparent singularity that a Reformer and moderate Conservative should be found united, I do not think that the country will continue averse to the claims the present administration have for their cordial support. All thinking persons must have noticed that in the settlement of all the great questions which have agitated this country for many years; theoretical views of government; the municipal system; the assessment laws; the school act; the jury laws, and all other questions; in the settlement, one by one, of all these the boundary lines of parties must have broken down.<sup>79</sup> The Clergy Reserves had alone remained to keep those divisions up<sup>80</sup>. But it may suit the purpose of the member for Lambton, still to persist in opposition, and not content with driving the best men in the reform party from power, may wish to do the same with the present administration, (hear, hear).<sup>81</sup> The hon. member for Lambton had taunted the Ministerial side of the House with the divisions that existed, with the discordant materials of which it was composed.<sup>82</sup> I have only to say on behalf of my colleagues and myself that whatever may be the opinions of the opposition as to the divisions that exists (sic) in the government, on all important matters, the house and the country will find that we are united, and that on all the subjects that have been embraced in the Speech and which will be offered, there will be a united Council. So far as the future policy is concerned they have the deepest interest in [the] welfare of the country<sup>83</sup>; and if a determination to maintain intact the Union of the Provinces so happily formed, if a desire to preserve the attachment of Canada to the Mother Country, if a desire to do even-handed justice to all parties, if a wish to observe economy in the Administration of all its affairs, if an anxious wish to develop the resources of the country<sup>84</sup>, extending public improvements,<sup>85</sup> and to promote the interests of agriculture deserved the approbation of the House, then the Ministry merited the confidence of the House and of the country.<sup>86</sup> And when we shall have an opportunity of laying before the House such measures as are shadowed forth in the speech, it will be seen that no government could have a more anxious desire ... to do justice to all classes of the people, or to promote the trade or prosperity of the country in its commerce and manufactures, and to secure peace, happiness and contentment, with civil and religious liberty among all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. The hon. gentleman sat down<sup>87</sup>.

Round of applause from the Ministerial benches<sup>88</sup> [OR] very great applause from both sides of the House.<sup>89</sup>

Mr. HOLTON spoke like Mr. S. from the reform point of view, but having no desire to keep open differences in that party, and instead of dwelling on their defence, he would prefer to do his best to re-organise it, though it had now been so long broken up.<sup>90</sup> [He] said, that in the course of this debate, a great many charges had been brought against the Administration, but a new charge had now been brought against them by the Hon. Postmaster General, that they had deserted their former ally, the gentleman to whose exertions they were indebted for their seats in this House, the hon. member for Lambton. (Hear, hear and laughter.) That was a charge which he himself would have shrunk from making. It was made against the ministry, by their own colleague, the Postmaster General. (Laughter.) A good many of his friends on that side of the House had expressed their disappointment at the paucity of topics treated of in the speech. He was one of those who had been so disappointed. He considered the speech eminently characteristic and eminently worthy of a coalition government.<sup>91</sup>

Grunt from MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON.<sup>92</sup>

[MR. HOLTON:] I hear that beautiful groan of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and shall give due heed to it. (Laughter.)<sup>93</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON.--That is very respectable, proceeding from the hon. member for Montreal.<sup>94</sup>

MR. CHRISTIE.--And very euphonious from the member for Montmorenci. (Laughter.)<sup>95</sup>

MR. HOLTON continued, that when he was interrupted by the groan of the hon. member for Montmorenci, he was saying that the Speech was eminently characteristic of a Coalition Government.<sup>96</sup> In it the Ministry said a good deal of the past<sup>97</sup>. It told the story of their origin, and dwelt at great length on what they had done, but it also proclaimed their utter incapacity, on account of the vice inherent in all Coalition Governments, to grapple successfully with those great questions<sup>98</sup> which were constantly arising in the present<sup>99</sup>, on the right settlement of which the destinies of our country depended. (Hear, hear.) The present Government had been founded on the surrender of those principles which they had advocated all their lives.<sup>100</sup> The price they paid for the offices they now held was the agreement entered into between them and their predecessors, that they would carry certain measures which they had formerly opposed. The first of these, and the most important in some of its aspects was the question of the Clergy Reserves. He admitted with regard to that question that they carried out their pledge thus far, that they took it up promptly and decidedly, and carried a measure having for its object the settlement of that long vexed question, but unfortunately for themselves and for the peace of the country, they embodied in their Bill a provision, the effect of which--he knew the Attorney General disclaimed having had any such object--but the inevitable effect of that provision had been to reproduce the old grievance in a form more obnoxious in many points of view than before. (Cheers.) It had been said by the Inspector-General, or rather by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cameron) that the commutation money received by one of the churches was somewhere in the neighbourhood of a million of dollars. How was that to be invested? Of course in lands. The Church Society had power to hold an unlimited amount of lands, and the commutation money would of course be invested in land. Now was it to be supposed that some 15 or 20 years hence, when that million of dollars had become worth, by the labour of the people of this country, and its rapid growth and prosperity, some 5 or 6 or 10 millions of dollars--was it to be supposed that the people of this country would forget the origin of that property? (Hear, hear.) Or that they would fail to raise an agitation with regard to the property possessed by the churches, founded on those endowments? (Hear, hear.) The man who expected anything of the kind had read history in vain. (Hear, hear.) Next in order of the questions with which those hon. gentlemen proposed to deal was the great Lower Canada question, that of the Seigniorial Tenure. He shrank from saying much on that topic, for he remembered how the Hon. Attorney-General East last year taunted non-professional men with their ignorance of the subject, and said it required the study of a life-time to master it. It would seem, however, that the Bill which he succeeded finally in passing, not the Bill he introduced, not the Bill recommended by his own convictions, but the Bill forced upon him by the late Governor-General, Lord Elgin--<sup>101</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order! The name of the Governor General of the country should not be introduced into this house.<sup>102</sup>

MR. HOLTON said he corceived (sic) he was relating a historical event, and referring to no party in relationship to this house, and he thought he was at liberty to use terms which it would have been out of order to use in reference to the Governor General of the day. He was going to point out the anomaly of the late Governor General remaining at the Seat of his Government for several weeks after the arrival of his successor<sup>103</sup> (order, order)<sup>104</sup>, contrary to all precedent, and in violation, he must say, of all decency<sup>105</sup> and independence (cries of no, no, and shame)<sup>106</sup>.

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order!<sup>107</sup>

MR. HOLTON continued to say that he believed they were indebted to that circumstance for the Bill which the learned Attorney-General ultimately passed through the House. He was not in a position to speak of the value of that Bill, on a subject that required the study of a lifetime for the Attorney-General to understand, but it seemed as if it were going to consume the lifetime of all the judges of the land to enable them to understand it also<sup>108</sup>, judging from the length of time they had been engaged in its consideration.<sup>109</sup> (Hear, hear.) He believed, however, thus much might be said, that, so far from the statement of the speech being justified by facts, there was at this moment a larger amount of dissatisfaction in Lower Canada on the subject of the Seigniorial Tenure, than at any time during the last two or three years. (Hear, hear<sup>110</sup>, [and] loud cries of no, no).<sup>111</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER interrupted him to state that if the hon. gentlemen (sic) wished to speak for his own village, he might do so, but should not speak of the whole Province as being dissatisfied.<sup>112</sup>

MR. HOLTON said that certainly the press which was supposed to represent the opinions of the colleagues of the Provincial Secretary, gave evidence that what he had said was perfectly correct. (Hear, hear.) He would refer the Provincial Secretary, and the Attorney-General East, to the Patrie for the state of opinion in Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) He came next to the third great measure which the present Government, since its formation, had professed to support; he referred to the great question of a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council, which,<sup>113</sup> from the reform point of view he occupied,<sup>114</sup> he considered to be of more importance than either of the others. What had been the course of the Government on that question? He put it to them, whether there was one member of that Government--except, perchance, the Postmaster-General--who sincerely and on principle desired to effect that change in the constitution of the country. What did the honorable Attorney-General West say the other night? He said his sole object in taking up the measure was to prevent a mischievous shape being given to it. He did not say that he was in favor of the principle, but seeing that public opinion was setting in that direction, he resolved to jump upon it and correct it, and ride himself into power and place upon it. He was sorry that the hon. gentleman should have put his adhesion to the Liberal side of the question on such a ground as that, a ground so unworthy of his intellect. So much for the past, and when they had got through those portions of the Speech which related to those oldstock questions in politics, they found the Government at their wits' end, and having nothing more to propose. And why had they nothing to propose?<sup>115</sup> The hon. the Postmaster General ... [said] the Administration were in perfect accordance on all the great subjects they had introduced, which, he stated, might be true, but, he would ask, how did they stand in reference to those measures which they had not brought forward?<sup>116</sup> Why were they unable to

deal with the questions now pressing on the country? It was not from any want of ability or intellect on the part of some members of the Government, but simply because they could not agree upon those questions among themselves. (Hear, hear<sup>117</sup>).

Cries of "name them" from the Ministerial side.<sup>118</sup>

MR. HOLTON, in reply, enumerated and commented upon<sup>119</sup> several great questions<sup>120</sup>. Take the Ottawa Canal, which at least ought to have been mentioned in the speech. He would mention too the project of a canal from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain. If, too, there were a national work in the Province, the Victoria bridge was certainly one; how is it there was no mention of that? The Crown Lands Commissioner had stopped the work last year, and he thought that the government should have explained their intentions on this subject. The same thing was true as to the Toronto shore road. In questions of trade and commerce there was the same silence. The Inspector General, last session, had promised to consider the propriety of our merchants being allowed to import tea and sugar on the same terms as those in the United States. Nothing was said about that; nothing about reciprocity of trade with France, about which there was lately so much excitement. On the seat of government, too, he thought the government were bound to have a policy and to describe it.<sup>121</sup> In fact, he believed that none of the great material interests of the country had received any consideration whatever at their hands.<sup>122</sup> The hon. gentleman then stated that he must allude to one or two points touched upon by the Provincial Secretary in his harangue of some five or six hours in length.<sup>123</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--Five or six hours?<sup>124</sup>

MR. HOLTON.--Perhaps 4½. He intended, however, to dwell very shortly on the hon. gentleman's speech. The whole gist of it so far as he could understand it, was to charge his hon. colleague (Mr. Dorion,) with having aspersed his country, by speaking of the people of Lower Canada as if they were in the matter of education in a state of semi-barbarism. He had not thought that any hon. gentleman could have so far misunderstood the meaning of his hon. friend, (hear, hear) or that any one could for a moment have imagined that his words were intended, or could possibly bear such a construction. (Hear, hear.)<sup>125</sup> That, however, was not all, for the member for Vercheres had chosen to represent him as having some part in the prejudices which he was pleased to say had place in the hearts of some persons in Lower Canada. He was astonished at such a remark coming from the member for Vercheres, since he always had worked on the same side in politics with that gentleman down to a very recent period,<sup>126</sup> but he forsook him when he saw those reactionary tendencies developing themselves, which ultimately landed him where he now was, in the embraces of the old Tory<sup>127</sup> family-compact party<sup>128</sup>--(laughter)--which had well nigh ruined this Province of Upper Canada<sup>129</sup> [OR] which had so long oppressed the country.<sup>130</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>131</sup> When he found that to ally himself with the old tory party, the member for Vercheres was ready to desert and crush that tried reformer, Mr. Papineau, he (Mr. H.) and his friends thought it time to set up a new organization to separate from that gentleman.<sup>132</sup> They were sometimes taunted with the divisions which existed on that side of the House, and the want of a common object. He was free to admit that differences did exist to a certain extent. But why? He maintained that those who entered into an unholy and unnatural compact on that side, were responsible for the divisions, for all honest men who shrunk from endorsing that compact were of course driven jostled into

opposition. (Hear, hear.)<sup>133</sup> Mr. H. then turned to the question of representation according to population, and declared himself as a reformer in favor of that principle, which he thought must come if the Legislative Union was to be continued.<sup>134</sup> He did not think it, however, so pressing as some of his hon. friends, as there was not yet any distinct evidence of the supposed disparity in population between the two Provinces, in the shape of a census Report.<sup>135</sup> But he believed the better solution of this question might be something like a federal union, in which the great interests of the country might be attended to by the federal parliament, and the parish business by the local legislatures.<sup>136</sup> Mr. Holton then proceeded to comment on the speech and on the position of the hon. and learned member for Toronto, (Mr. Cameron.) He had a very great respect for the talents of that hon. gentleman, and he had hoped to have found him assuming a more independent position this session that (*sic*) he had had. (Hear, hear.) In this he had been disappointed. He had no hesitation in saying that much as he disapproved of the political transactions which led to the formation of the present Government, and that sudden change in the views of some of the hon. gentlemen who now occupied seats on the Treasury benches, he nevertheless was of opinion that their position was infinitely more reputable than that of the member for Toronto. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman assumed the position of being a supporter of the Government on all test questions, and yet he took great merit to himself for consistency in opposing them on all questions where he knew they were sure of the support of hon. gentlemen on the side of the Opposition. On all occasions where his votes would be of any value to displace the Government, he voted with them. (Hear, hear.) He maintained that under our system the man who sustained a Government on test questions, on trials of strength perilling their existence, whatever other votes he might give, whatever shame he might set up, was responsible for every act of that Government, as much as if he voted constantly with them. (Hear, hear.) It was perfectly absurd, therefore, for the hon. gentleman to claim merit--on the contrary he conceived it to be his greatest demerit--that he opposed the Government on certain questions, while he did everything he could to keep them in their seats.<sup>137</sup> In this way the hon. member took credit for independence, while he was in fact one of the most regular supporters of the ministry.<sup>138</sup> He had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have taken up a different position this session. He was sorry he had not. It was for the hon. gentleman to explain his inconsistencies if he could. He (Mr. H.) had done his duty in pointing out what he conceived the extraordinary position he occupied. (Hear, hear.) The other night that hon. gentleman made a violent attack on the hon. member for Lambton for what he termed his violence on certain questions, and he ended by agreeing with the hon. member for Lambton and accepting all his conclusions, but yet because he was unpopular with certain parties, a governmental impossibility as he described himself, the hon. member for Toronto chose to abuse the member for Lambton for urging the same opinions which he himself held. (Hear, hear.) He regretted very much that a gentleman of the distinguished talents of the hon. member for Toronto should occupy in this House the position which he did. (Hear, hear.) It had been frequently asked what were the objects of the opposition. Speaking for himself, he would say that his desire was to break up the present Ministry, to re-organize the liberal party, now unfortunately disunited<sup>139</sup>, so that they might hold office.<sup>140</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>141</sup> If that could not be done, then<sup>142</sup> the next best thing to having a liberal government was to have<sup>143</sup> the re-establishment of a strong Tory Government, and a strong Liberal Opposition. When he said a strong Tory Government he meant such a one as would consist of Sir Allan MacNab, Mr. Cauchon, Mr. Cayley, Mr. Lemieux, Mr. Sol. Gen. Smith, and Col. Tache.<sup>144</sup>

A voice.--Where is the Attorney General West?<sup>145</sup>

MR. HOLTON could not well tell where he was. If rumours were, however, to be believed, it seemed that that gentleman had taken up his lot with the Liberal party, and on that ground he had not chosen to rank him with the rest of the Ministry.<sup>146</sup> The opposition had passed through a long ordeal, and he would now put it to the liberal members on the government side of the house, if they are prepared to take the responsibility of dividing any longer the liberal ranks. He would not refer to the course of action which they thought it their duty to pursue at the great Ministerial crisis of 1854. He had no doubt they acted at that time conscientiously. But they have not the same excuse now. Will they then take the responsibility of continuing the divis[i]on in the Reform ranks, by supporting the Ministerial side.<sup>147</sup> He now called on ... [them] to say whether their old organization is to be reformed, and he warned them that the time was coming when this question would be forced upon them in a louder voice. Before long there would be as (sic) appeal to the country, and if they went to the polls without a reorganization they must then expect to find that through their acts their party was annihilated.<sup>148</sup> (Cheers.)<sup>149</sup>

MR. POWELL addressed the House shortly<sup>150</sup>. [He] would have occupied his seat, had it not been for the allusion to him made, by the hon. member for Montreal. His course of action he had resolved on so far as the present government were concerned. He was not likely to follow the views of the hon. member for Montreal--neither was he satisfied with those of the hon. member for Lambton. As regards the present Ministry, he (Mr. Powell) considered them merely filling a gap, as merely men of convenience,<sup>151</sup> men who could adapt themselves to the country as they had to the House; men who, when they had used up their own stock-in-trade, would make way for better ones.<sup>152</sup>

Hear, hear, from the Opposition.<sup>153</sup>

[MR. POWELL:] They are not the right men in the right place.<sup>154</sup>

Hear, hear, and cheers from the Opposition.<sup>155</sup>

[MR. POWELL:] He might be denounced for such language by a press which gained any consideration it possessed from the fact of its being regarded as the Ministerial organ.<sup>156</sup> The Leader..., he said, owed all its influence to the Government, though it used it to destroy the supporters of the Government<sup>157</sup>. This paper had attacked the hon. member for Toronto (Hon. J.H. Cameron,) whose lead ... [he] was prepared to follow<sup>158</sup> [OR] a man whom he was proud to follow<sup>159</sup>. The hon. gentleman went on to remark that he was not prepared to aid the breaking up of the Ministry at the present time, while he could not see how another could be formed<sup>160</sup> [OR] till he could set up a better one.<sup>161</sup> He was not prepared to find fault with the policy foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne. If it had any fault, it was rather that of omission than of Commission. In the meantime he (Mr. P.) considered it his duty to sustain the Ministry in organizing a Police force, which even the Opposition journals proved to be necessary. He would sustain the Ministry so long as they showed themselves worthy of his support.<sup>162</sup> [He] concluded by declaring himself no "evangelist" of the Brown School, but a supporter of the Administration.<sup>163</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON. Lorsque l'hon. représentant de la cité de Montréal (M. Holton) s'est levé et s'est mis à parler de ce qu'il appelle la politique commerciale du gouvernement, j'espérais l'entendre traiter cette question d'une façon originale, nous faire part de quelques idées neuves, nous montrer, en un mot, la voie lumineuse, à nous qu'il accuse de guider le pays dans l'ignorance et l'obscurantisme.

Aussi quel n'a pas été mon étonnement, je dirai même mon désappointement, en voyant que l'hon. membre n'a aucune nouvelle mesure à nous proposer pour raviver le commerce de Montréal qui se meurt, dit-il, par notre faute. C'est un médecin bavard qui sait discourir longuement sur la maladie, qui croit présomptueusement en retracer toutes les causes, mais qui reste silencieux, par incapacité plutôt que par modestie, dès qu'il faut indiquer le remède. En vérité, je ne crois pas que la nation ait un grand besoin de pareils docteurs; tout ce qu'ils ont dit, en effet, depuis l'ouverture des débats sur l'Adresse, il n'y a pas un seul petit journal de l'opposition qui ne l'ait déjà répété à satiété à ses abonnés pendant les douze mois passés. Ce sont de petites chicanes sur telle et telle question dont le pays se met fort peu en souci ou qui n'intéressent tout au plus qu'une localité; ce sont des redites, des lieux communs sur la corruption du gouvernement, des banalités sur la négligence et l'incapacité de l'administration. Mais faut-il traiter de façon de maître les questions pratiques, le moment arrive-t-il de descendre des sphères des généralités jusqu'au terrain de la réalité, de critiquer les grandes mesures du gouvernement depuis la dernière session, ils semblent être à bout de faconde. Mais n'est-ce pas le mauvais vouloir plutôt que l'impuissance qui leur ferme ainsi les lèvres? S'ils étaient plus sincères, ne trouveraient-ils dans nos actes rien à louer, à approuver?

Je parle de leur sincérité, comme si chacun de nous ne savait déjà que ce noble sentiment leur est entièrement étranger. S'il en était autrement, n'auraient-ils pas déjà donné au pays la profession de foi de leur politique? ne lui auraient-ils pas déroulé leur bannière, proclamé leur devise politique, pour qu'il pût juger par lui-même entre les deux camps rivaux?<sup>164</sup> [OR] In fairness, the hon. member should at the very least, have said something of what the policy of the Opposition was composed, in order that members on this side of the House may form an opinion how far superior such policy was to that laid down by the Government. (Hear, hear.)<sup>165</sup>

Cependant, tout en gardant le silence sur leurs principes, tout en craignant de s'attaquer aux grandes mesures que le gouvernement a menées à bonne fin, les députés de la gauche font grande parade de ce qu'ils nomment les péchés d'omission du gouvernement. A les entendre, il aurait fallu inventerier (sic) dans le discours du trône tous les bills passés, présents et à venir dont la Chambre a eu, a ou aura à s'occuper.

Ce n'est pas tout; entre les faibles attaques dirigées contre l'administration, j'en ai remarqué une, lancée par l'hon. représentant de Montréal, et qui m'est tout-à-fait personnelle. Il m'accuse d'avoir des vues restreintes, de m'appliquer exclusivement à défendre les intérêts de ma localité, à ne songer qu'à Québec et à ses environs, en un mot à suivre une pitoyable politique de clocher.

Je le demande aux hon. membres qui m'entourent, je le demande même en toute candeur aux hon. députés assis en face de moi, eussé-je mérité un pareil reproche, était-ce à lui à me l'adresser, à lui dont toutes les affections semblent s'être concentrées, non sur une partie quelconque du pays, mais sur une seule ville, celle qu'il représente? S'il en veut, en effet, au gouvernement, c'est que, dans son opinion, ce dernier ne s'est pas exclusivement occupé du canal de Caughnawaga et de celui de l'Outaouais. Toute autre affaire administrative cessante, les membres de l'administ[r]ation auraient dû consacrer leurs veilles et leur activité à la mise en exécution de ces plans dont quelques uns sont d'ailleurs tout nouveaux et n'ont pas même été encore mûris par les hommes qui les ont proposés. A cette seule condition, le gouvernement pouvait bien mériter du pays; à cette seule condition pouvait-il rencontrer l'approbation du député de Montréal. Il est pourtant d'autres questions que celui-ci effleure, nous devons l'avouer en toute justice. Par exemple, il se lance quelquefois dans des aperçus sur le commerce; mais est-ce du commerce, de la Province entière qu'il s'occupe? non, c'est de celui de Montréal. D'autres fois, il

essaiera de parler architecture, de se poser en ingénieur et de donner des leçons au gouvernement sur la façon de conduire les travaux publics; mais est-ce sur tous les travaux entrepris pour améliorer l'état du pays, qu'il jette son regard d'aigle? assurément non, il s'en garderait bien: c'est sur le pont Victoria seulement qu'il tourne son attention. Telle est la politique large et désintéressée du député de Montréal: le canal de l'Outaouais, le canal de Caughnawaga, le commerce de Montréal et le pont Victoria, c'est là le commencement et la fin de sa politique, l'alpha et l'oméga de sa foi. Montréal d'abord, puis Montréal et enfin Montréal pour faire diversion; après Montréal, il n'y a plus qu'à tirer le rideau et se croiser les bras. (rires et applaud.) Et c'est pourtant l'hon. membre, esclave d'une politique à si courte vue, qui a osé me reprocher de ne songer qu'à Québec! Si j'ai jamais mérité un pareil reproche, c'est du moins en me faisant l'avocat de mesures qui devaient contribuer à la prospérité de Québec, il est vrai, mais dont l'heureux effet devait encore s'étendre sur une grande partie du pays, jusqu'à la population même de Montréal.

J'allais oublier un autre reproche que m'a adressé le représentant de Montréal. Il nous fait le reproche, à nous membres<sup>166</sup> bas-canadiens<sup>167</sup> du gouvernement ou simples partisans de l'adminis[tra]tion, d'avoir déserté la bannière de M. Papineau. J'étais loin, je l'avoue, de songer à une semblable attaque. S'il est ici, dans cette enceinte, un homme qui continue la politique de M. Papineau, qui y soit resté fidèle, où le chercherons-nous cet homme? dans les rangs de l'opposition?<sup>168</sup>

Cris de oui! oui!<sup>169</sup>

[MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON:] Mes adversaires, Monsieur l'Orateur, se sont hâtés de me répondre qu'ils sont encore les apôtres de la profession de foi prêchée par l'hon. M. Papineau. De bons apôtres, en vérité! qui ont renié leur maître, sur la question par excellence, sur celle qu'il déclarait être la pierre de touche de sa politique, la clef de voûte de son système, la question de la tenure seigneuriale!<sup>170</sup>

Grognements à gauche, applaudissements à droite.<sup>171</sup>

[MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON:] Ces messieurs peuvent grogner, je reconnais qu'ils en ont l'occasion et qu'ils savent s'acquitter de cette tâche. J'oserais même dire que le seul passage éloquent du discours de l'hon. membre pour Montréal, c'est celui dans lequel ce député poussa deux grognements comme le De profundis du commerce de Montréal. (Rires et protestations.) Oui, je le répète, ses deux grognements ont été les seuls sons sortis de sa bouche, qui aient eu quelque signification; quant à toutes ses autres paroles, ce n'étaient que des sons vides [de] sens. N'était-il pas vrai que les hommes de la suite de l'hon. M. Papineau l'ont lâchement abandonné sur le terrain de la tenure seigneuriale?<sup>172</sup> Was it not a fact that they, the party with whom the hon. member for Montreal was now acting, had expressed their conviction that the Ministry would fail because it was too Conservative, more so than the present gentlemen. Was it not a fact that those gentlemen could not agree upon the great questions which it was essential should be brought up?<sup>173</sup> Allez donc proclamer sur les toits votre amour pour M. Papineau et vos regrets de l'avoir vu délaissé par quelques membres du cabinet. Si ce chef politique avait encore à chercher des amis dans cette chambre, c'est ici, dans ces rangs, parmi ceux qui m'entourent, qu'il pourrait en trouve[r]. (Dénégations bruyantes.) Oui, c'est ici seulement, et pour vous ôter à l'avenir tout courage de mentionner ce nom, souvenez-vous à jamais de la question seigneuriale, et rougissez!

Il est encore une autre question que l'opposition n'ose manier qu'avec la plus grande réserve; mais celle-là du moins n'appartient pas au passé; elle est encore dans toute l'incertitude d'un futur fuyant sans cesse devant l'examen. C'est la question de la représentation basée sur la population. Quelles sont les opinions respectives des membres de l'opposition sur cet important sujet? Le représentant de Montréal dit bien que d'une façon abstraite, qu'en théorie, il est en faveur de la représentation basée sur la population, mais que le temps n'est pas encore venu de mettre cette théorie (sic) en pratique. Et pourquoi, s'il vous plaît, M. l'Orateur, le temps n'est-il pas encore venu? C'est parce que l'hon. membre a peur des reproches que lui adresseraient ses commettants; c'est parce qu'il espère n'avoir pas à voter sur cette grande question avant les prochaines élections. Voilà toute sa pensée, lorsqu'il nous assure que le temps n'est pas encore venu; c'est du jour des élections qu'il veut parler. Ce jour une fois passé, on le verrait reprendre toute sa confiance et déclarer qu'on ne saurait trop se hâter de baser la représentation nationale sur la population.<sup>174</sup> The fact is, that the hon. gentleman has not the courage to vote upon that question. (Hear, hear). I would remind the hon. gentleman that there are many members from Upper Canada who are not prepared to vote upon that question, if representation be based upon population. I had the courage to vote against that principle. As to the p[r]inciples of the hon. member for Montreal, what are they? He wished to be considered as the great exponent of trade, but what is the sum of his great commercial policy and of what is it composed? Why the great Victoria Bridge and the trade of Montreal; and he has not the courage to vote in accordance with his avowed principles.<sup>175</sup> [Mr. Cauchon] asked if Montreal was satisfied with such conduct in her representative.<sup>176</sup>

Et ce sont là les hommes, M. l'Orateur, qui prétendent nous régenter! ce sont là les hommes qui nous lancent chacun son dard, eux qui manquent de franchise, eux qui n'ont pas le moindre sentiment de courage! Le coeur leur fait défaut. (Tempête de grognements et d'applaudissements.) Oui, c'est de la lâcheté de leur part, de n'avoir que deux ou trois mesures à faire triompher et de ne pas oser les mettre en avant.

Après cela, qu'importe le nom dont s'affuble tel ou tel parti? qu'importe au pays qu'à telle couleur politique soit réservé le surnom de libérale, et au camp contraire, celui de tory, si dans toutes les grandes épreuves, les prétendus libéraux abandonnent les vrais intérêts du pays, se font petits de bruyants qu'ils étaient, tandis que les Torys ou ceux qu'on espère stigmatiser par ce nom, travaillent fidèlement et sans relâche au bonheur de la nation?<sup>177</sup> If the measures of the Government were more liberal than those of their opponents why should they be called Tories--why not call them liberals?<sup>178</sup> Ce n'est pas de l'écorce, ni de la forme de la tige, ni même de la couleur et de la coupe du feuillage qu'on se met en peine, mais bien des fruits que l'arbre porte; et, M. l'Orateur, les fruits que l'opposition a donnés jusqu'à présent, sont à la fois en petit nombre et amers dans sa bouche.

Qu'ils aillent dans nos campagnes, qu'ils ressassent leurs banalités contre nous, et puis, qu'ils nous disent le résultat de leurs prédications. Quels progrès font-ils comme parti? Tout ce qu'ils ont élevé contre le gouvernement n'est-il pas retombé sur eux? toutes les armes qu'ils ont forgées contre nous, ne se sont-elles pas tournées contre eux?<sup>179</sup> Had not all ... [their] sentiments ... been repeated and repeated ever since the formation of the Government, and had they been at all adopted by the people?<sup>180</sup> Le pays n'est-il pas encore pour nous, aujourd'hui comme l'an dernier? Je dirai même aujourd'hui plus que l'an dernier, car il a appris à connaître nos ennemis, il a pu nous comparer à eux, et ne fût-ce que par le contraste, le mérite de nos principes a tellement brillé à ses yeux, qu'il s'est pris à nous appuyer plus encore que jamais.

Il est inutile de sourire, l'incrédulité n'est plus permise, et l'hon. membre que je vois dans le coin en face de moi, répondre silencieusement à me[s] paroles par des rires qu'il s'efforce de rendre sarcastiques, ferait mieux d'indiquer une seule mesure du gouvernement qui ne soit au plus haut point libérale.<sup>181</sup> The present administration had been charged with changing their policy and their principles, but I do wish that the hon. gentleman from Montreal and his friends would define their principles if theyh (sic) have any.<sup>182</sup> Ses principes à lui tendent vers le parti annexion[n]iste--<sup>183</sup>

MR. HOLTON interrompt l'orateur par une observation qu'on ne peut entendre des tribunes.<sup>184</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON.--Très-bien! L'hon. membre me demande d'interpréter mon épithète d'annexion[n]iste que je lui ai adressée; j'obtempérerai à sa prière lorsqu'il m'aura donné, lui, l'explication des termes de tory et de conservateur libéral.<sup>185</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER here offered a remark upon a point of order.<sup>186</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON continued, if the measures of the Government are not sufficiently Liberal, blame them, point out wherein they fail. You have them before you. Why has not the hon. member for Montreal, and the other gentlemen supporting him pointed out any point differing from the sentiments which [t]he Government have announced in the Spee[c]h.<sup>187</sup> Of what was the Opposition composed? There were almost as many materials of opposition as there were members.<sup>188</sup> Définir cette chose hétérogène qui se place dans les bancs à gauche, grand Dieu! ne serait-ce pas une chose difficile, impossible même! Par où faudrait-il commencer l'examen? Nous avons d'un côté le membre pour Lambton--<sup>189</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Oh! nous en avons eu assez de cela.<sup>190</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON.--Oui, je conçois que l'hon. membre ait eu assez de ces vérités déplaisantes; mais le pays ne saurait trop les entendre. N'a-t-il pas lui aussi donné à satiété, dans son journal et dans cette enceinte, ses longues tirades contre l'administration?<sup>191</sup> What were his principles? He was, in his speeches, continually talking of "we," but--(the conclusion of the sentence was lost in the laughter of the House.) It was a general observation that he acted with himself alone. His party in opposition could not go with him on any point. Then there was the member for Montreal. Even the members of Lower Canada were obliged to say they had no feeling with him. There was not a man in the House [who] stood in his position.<sup>192</sup>

The speaker was interrupted by cries of "six o'clock," and the House separated for recess.<sup>193</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON then resumed. He had said that the Opposition who accused the government of being made up of discordant materials, were themselves, of many principles and persons. He went on to exemplify, by citing the diversities of opinion entertained betwixt several members of the Opposition whom he ranged in pairs for this purpose--as the member for Lambton and the member for Montreal, (Mr. Dorion)--the member for Lambton and the member for Haldimand--the other member for Montreal and Mr. Galt.<sup>194</sup> He went over the several divisions of

the oppositions; the Brownites and Rouges--who could be called Rouges no longer now, he supposed (sic). He pointed out their differences on the questions of Separate Schools, Representation by Population, and the Elective Legislative Council. The hon. member for Glengarry also disagreed with them on some questions. The member for Haldimand was another element of opposition. The honble. member for London, again was the representative of some principle, he supposed but having no party he was the man Mr. Hincks tried to make a prime Minister, but when he failed in that he deserted him and his friends. Then came the hon. member of Norfolk; did he agree with the hon. member for Lambton or the hon. member for Haldimand? Then there were the honble. members for Montreal and for the town of Sherbrooke; do they agree with other shades of opposition politics?<sup>195</sup> There were those among them, as was known, who had aspired to the position of Inspector General, and it was well understood, that all these things were arranged among them. What sort of a government would these have presented with such discordant materials.<sup>196</sup> Has the member for Sherbrooke always held the opinions now avowed by the member for Montreal?<sup>197</sup> The member for Montreal and Mr. Galt, agreed, indeed, on the subject of railways, but on what other point could they be found in agreement? They would sacrifice everything to them.<sup>198</sup> Did the hon. member for Montreal agree with his colleague upon the question of representation by population--the latter saying he was in favor of it--but now, would the hon. and learned member agree to it? Then, there was the other, the senior member for Montreal,<sup>199</sup> (Mr. Dorion),<sup>200</sup> who was to a great extent the exponent of the commercial policy of the opposition. Yet he had disagreed with his colleg[u]es--held few principles in common with them.<sup>201</sup> Then there was the member for Lincoln. Did any other gentlemen agree with him on matters of trade; and these were indeed all his principles. He had no other than a commercial policy--his principle was "no railways, canals, and no duties." The hon. member for Lambton had made a speech of four hours, and it would be difficult to point at any one thing in it but fanaticism, fanaticism, fanaticism--nothing but appeals against Catholicism, appealing to God against its professors, and to the magistrates not to perform their duty.<sup>202</sup> Son dernier grand discours..., qu'était-ce, sinon la répétition de toutes les viles et lâches platitudes dont il assaisonne régulièrement ses effets oratoires ou littéraires. Qu'y voit-on briller, à l'exception de la sinistre lueur du fanatisme? Faisant appel aux plus basses passions de la multitude, il sème à pleines mains la haine d'une race pour l'autre; il en appelle à chaque instant à Dieu, des ministres de Dieu même; il ne craint pas de blesser grossièrement les sentiments les plus sacrés qu'abrite le coeur de l'homme; il marche vers son but, foulant les droits des autres et se faisant une haie de tout ce qu'il immole sur sa route: l'union, la concorde, l'amour fraternel, la tolérance mutuelle, tout ce qui est noble en un mot, tout ce qui peut cimenter l'union entre les deux races qui peuplent cette province, et ne laissant debout qu'un seul sentiment, le plus épouvantable de tous, le fanatisme religieux!<sup>203</sup> He should have refrained from this course, were it only from motives of prudence, for it could serve him little to exhibit such a feeling. That was not the way to gain the confidence of the people, or a high position in that House. He would find, that it would not in the end answer his purpose to appeal to the worst passions of men<sup>204</sup> and ... [exert] himself to breed hatred and ill-will among the people.<sup>205</sup> Ne fait-il pas, au contraire, (par imprudence plutôt qu'à bon escient) tout ce qu'il faut pour se fermer à jamais les barrières du pouvoir? Peut-il jamais compter parmi ses amis les députés catholiques, à quelque parti politique qu'ils appartiennent, pourvu qu'ils se respectent? Car ce n'est pas l'autre jour pour la première fois qu'il a insulté le catholicisme en disant que les peuples guidés par le clergé de cette religion sont plongés dans l'ignorance. Un jour, l'année dernière, à Québec, il osa dire, cet homme, (tendant le bras vers

M. Brown) que les peuples catholiques sont non-seulement ignorants, mais immoraux. (Sensation pénible dans l'auditoire.) Il outragea la religion du peuple qui l'entourait et d'un grand nombre de ses collègues; il outragea leurs familles, leurs femmes, leurs mères; et moi, comme d'autres, je ressentis l'insulte, mais je n'y répondis pas. (Applaud.)

Je ne répondis point à cette vile et lâche assertion, parce que, grâce à Dieu! la religion que je professe est bien trop pure pour pouvoir être jamais souillée par de si misérables accusations. Je n'y répondis pas, parce que ma religion n'a point besoin de défenseur et que je ne voulais pas m'ériger, à mon tour, en accusateur de la religion à laquelle lui, le membre pour Lambton, peut appartenir.<sup>206</sup> He had no desire to abuse Protestants. Was it just, was it Christian-like, thus to appeal to the prejudices and passions of men placed in this country to live together?<sup>207</sup>

Respecter les sentiments religieux des autres, afin de pouvoir exiger le respect des autres pour les siens, c'est là la grande règle, la règle d'or enseignée par le christianisme par ces mots sublimes: "Ne faites pas à autrui ce que vous ne voudriez pas que l'on vous fit." L'hon. membre pour Lambton parle beaucoup de liberté de conscience, de ce qu'il désigne sous le nom de voluntaryism. Mais qu'est-ce que la liberté de conscience, sinon de penser, de prier et d'adorer son Dieu selon sa conviction, et de permettre au prochain de se faire un Dieu selon ses propres inspirations? Mais si l'on s'élève au-dessus de tous les autres, proclamant sa bonne volonté de laisser à chacun le libre arbitre, à la condition toutefois que chacun pensera et basera sa croyance religieuse sur des données qu'on lui fournira, est-ce là de la liberté de conscience? Est-ce en professant de pareils principes qu'on peut espérer se trouver jamais assez fort pour arriver au pouvoir?<sup>208</sup> The hon. gentleman then went into a consideration of Mr. Brown's confession on his own views in regard to his holding any position in the Government. He had described himself as "a governmental impossibility."<sup>209</sup> And why? Because he had isolated himself by his fanaticism. A man so situated, obliged to make such a humiliating confession, proclaimed himself unfit for public life<sup>210</sup>. Que vient-il donc faire ici? que nous veut-il? pourquoi travaille-t-il à notre renversement quand il sait ne pas pouvoir nous remplacer? Dans un gouvernement constitutionnel, un homme qui se reconnaît incapable de mettre la main à l'oeuvre, de placer, à son tour, l'épaule contre la roue du char public, cet homme n'a rien plus à faire dans la vie publique, il est indigne de représenter son comté; qu'il se retire chez lui et cède la place à un autre plus utile.

Au lieu de cela, il nous obstrue sans cesse, nous le trouvons sur notre chemin, ne faisant rien mais nuisant aux hommes de bonne volonté<sup>211</sup>. The hon. member for Lambton had said ... he was a governmental impossibility<sup>212</sup> as being the result of his conscientious feeling.<sup>213</sup> Was it conscience that led him to make this avowal? Oh, no! they knew what his conscience was; they remembered that in 1849 he had written in favor of the Ecclesiastical Corporations Bill. He said then, we must support these Lower Canada liberals and keep the party together.<sup>214</sup> The hon. member might laugh, but he ought to blush at the recollection of that period! He could not deface from the Globe what he had there written of the Liberals of Lower Canada of that time--that there were only seven of them, besides a few loose fish. He ranked himself as a friend. What is a friend? Is it one who is always ready to abandon his companions, or one who is always ready to support them.<sup>215</sup> They had been told that the Lower Canada liberals had abandoned the Upper Canadians. It was not so; men like Mr. Brown, among the latter, had first deserted the former. They heard a great outcry from the hon. gentleman about the Legislative Council Bill, because, he said, ministers had deserted their previous opinions and policy. Why, so did men every day. Why not thus accuse the public, made up of individuals, who from time to

time changed their opinions on great questions?<sup>216</sup> The hon. member was like others always endeavouring to convert others to their principles; what consistency was there, then, in reproaching them with being changed? He would imply that change is dishonourable.<sup>217</sup> Si c'est une honte de changer d'opinion, pourquoi donc s'efforce-t-il de couvrir tant d'hommes de cette honte? Il m'a reproché, par exemple, d'avoir eu sur la question de l'éligibilité du Conseil Législatif, une opinion différente de celle que j'ai à présent.<sup>218</sup> [Mr. Cauchon] avoue qu'il y était opposé, mais qu'après avoir bien longtemps combattu ce principe, il a vu que son opposition était inutile et que l'opinion publique était bien décidément en faveur de l'élection du conseil; en conséquence (sic) il a abandonné son opinion et s'est soumis à celle du public.<sup>219</sup> Fallait-il persister à peu-près seul dans mon opinion quand le pays se déclarait contre? Est-ce là du bon sens, de la saine raison? Est-ce avec un si orgueilleux entêtement qu'on peut espérer de pouvoir administrer un pays, travailler au bien-être de ses concitoyens? Faut-il se mettre ... toujours au-dessus du peuple et dire d'un ton méprisant à la nation entière: "Abandonnez vos idées pour n'écouter que mes paroles; car, en vérité, seul j'ai du génie, seul j'ai du bon sens, seul je distingue la bonne route et vous tous, vous êtes dans l'erreur." C'est-là ce que l'hon. membre pour Lambton semble dire au peuple canadien de la province entière.<sup>220</sup> Next, on the subject of the comparative education of Upper and Lower Canada, he took a similar position to Mr. Cartier, alleging the colleges in Lower Canada were more widely diffused and superior to those of Upper Canada. But they had too much of classical education--too little, in proportion, of the more practical teaching of the common school.<sup>221</sup> The subject ... he contended had been misrepresented by the member for Lambton.<sup>222</sup> Il [Mr. Brown] compare le système d'enseignement public des deux parties du pays, vante l'éducation classique de l'une, ravale celle de l'autre, tandis qu'il est au sçu (sic) de tout le monde que s'il y a vice quelque part dans le Bas-Canada, c'est plutôt par la surabondance de l'éducation classique qu'on y reçoit.

Je m'arrête, M. l'Orateur, je ne veux point me mettre à épiloguer les discours de l'hon. membre pour Lambton. Trop de fois déjà on s'en est occupé; trop de fois on les a critiqués, leur accordant en cela une importance qu'ils n'ont point.<sup>223</sup> In conclusion he would make an appeal to the good feeling of members of the house. Differ as they might in religious conclusions, they should remember that the basis of true religion was love for one another, as fellow-Christians and fellow-countrymen. They should seek to extend good will and harmony among all classes. Could they hope to do this by uttering such incendiary speeches as those of the hon. member for Lambton, which he trusted the hon. member had the good feeling himself to regret.<sup>224</sup> Les paroles qui sortent de la bouche de l'hon. député sont comme une plante vénéneuse qu'il est mieux de laisser dans l'ombre; si elles peuvent amener aucun résultat, ce n'est que la haine et j'espère qu'à l'exception de ce représentant vous êtes tous animés de trop hauts sentiments chrétiens pour vous complaire dans le développement de cette passion. (M. Cauchon se rassied au milieu des applaudissements.)<sup>225</sup>

MR. GAMBLE said the question was on Mr. Brown's amendment, stating the Clergy Reserves Act had not settled the object for which it was framed, but had on the contrary endowed certain favored churches.<sup>226</sup> He could not subscribe to the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Lambton, because it wore on its very face, what he believed, was not a fact. He denied that the settlement of the Clergy Reserves had resulted in the exclusive endowment of certain churches.<sup>227</sup> He believed it had effected the object for which it was framed, the complete secularization of the reserves. Those who felt with him had been much indebted to the hon. member for

Lambton for procuring, by means of the agitation he had started, a re-affirmation and explanation of that bill, in the face of the attempted agitation; afterwards, also, by the petitions he caused to be drawn up; and again, by the position taken in Peterboro' he led to a popular verdict on the subject; showing that public opinion had stamped its approbation both on the act itself and the manner in which the commutation had been carried out.<sup>228</sup> Mr. Brown had, he would contend, greatly facilitated the passage of the commutation measure, and had, in fact, laid the foundation on which that measure was based. He for one could not vote for that amendment which said that the Clergy Reserve Act had not accomplished its avowed objects. It was true that act did not accomplish the views of the honorable member for Lambton. That honorable gentleman had declared that he desired to see the churches of England and Scotland paid in the most liberal manner, but if he was really sincere in that declaration, he (Mr. G.) very much regretted that his acts were very much at variance with his professions. If that gentleman had the disbursement of the funds, he (Mr. G.) felt perfectly satisfied that both churches would receive a particularly small dividend (laughter).<sup>229</sup> Little would they have had to hope for at his hands<sup>230</sup> [had] the hon. gentleman succeeded in his object, as regards this subject.--I do not believe, said he, that the hon. member for Lambton would have left them a shirt to their backs, and if they had one, he would have stripped it from them. The views of the hon. gentleman from Lambton, were not those held by this House or by the country at large.<sup>231</sup> He (Mr. G.) had been it was well known, strongly opposed to the secularization of the Reserves.<sup>232</sup> Although opposed to the system of robbery by which property set apart for religious purpose had been taken and applied to secular purposes, he felt that ministers had fulfilled their pledges and honestly carried the act into effect. If his vote would have upset the Government at the time it would have been given without a moment's hesitation. Was he to be told by the member (Mr. Holton) for Montreal that, bad as the conduct of the Government had been, that conduct of the hon. and learned member for Toronto, with whom he had acted throughout in this matter, was worse? That his conduct was tricky? Language of that kind, applied to his hon. and learned friend, applied also to himself; and who was it from whom the accusation came? From a man of yesterday. He it was who set himself up as the only man of purity and probity in the House--one who took it upon himself to be the censor of the House, and lecture this member and that on their conduct--a man who, a few years ago, entertained the treasonable intention of handing over this country to the United States--took it upon himself to pronounce upon the conduct of those who were his superiors in loyalty, talents and political consistency. He would end with the words of Burke: "It were unworthy of him to speak ill of a man of whom no one spoke well."<sup>233</sup> With regard to the speech, notwithstanding all that had been said on the matter and all the excuses made by honorable members in giving their opinions on the subject, he did not want to make any excuse, but would speak the sentiments of those who had sent him to that House.<sup>234</sup> It was said there was nothing of importance proposed in the speech. He held that the measures proposed in the speech were of the greatest practical utility--the measures which would commend themselves to the favor of the people of the country. With regard to the past, would they have ministers act against the will of this House, expressed by legislation? They deserve the commendation of the House that they have carried their wishes into effect.<sup>235</sup> What were the measures introduced this session? There was the principle of an Elective Council. It was a doctrine for which he went heart and hand<sup>236</sup> with the ministers<sup>237</sup>, one which he had advocated for many years.<sup>238</sup> He could trust them and the country could trust them in this, as they had carried out the intentions of Parliament so fully in respect to Clergy Reserves and the Seigniorial Tenure measures.<sup>239</sup> Till this principle was confined we never should have a sound, liberal government. Although the elective

principle was necessary for the welfare of the country, and would, he believed, receive the approbation of the country at large, the alteration of the constitution should not, in his opinion, be consummated by this House. He agreed with the hon. gentleman from Lincoln that we should have a written constitution<sup>240</sup>--

Hear, hear, from Rouges.<sup>241</sup>

[MR. GAMBLE continued:] ... but this House was not the proper place to frame it. He considered the proper course was to petition the Imperial Parliament for an alteration of the constitution. This should be ratified by the people.<sup>242</sup> They should ask at once for a right to hold a convention to frame a written constitution which would be above the control of Parliament.<sup>243</sup> There should be a power superior to this House. He did not believe in the doctrine of the supremacy of Parliament. It would be far better for us, said the speaker, if the highest office<sup>244</sup> in the land were also elective.<sup>245</sup> (Applause.)<sup>246</sup>

Hear, hear, from Rouges.<sup>247</sup>

[MR. GAMBLE:] He could not see why the representative of Her Majesty could not be a Canadian (cries of "order, order.") He would like to see a person filling that office, whose feelings were theirs--whose joys were theirs, and whose sentiments were theirs. Then, indeed, might they look forward with confidence to an efficient administration. And, he would maintain that until they had an elective Legislative Council, an elective Government, and a written Constitution, Canada would never be thoroughly prosperous and contented.<sup>248</sup> The hon. gentleman from Lincoln says that the fault of the present state of things is in the system. I agree with him perfectly, said the speaker. It makes no difference what gentlemen occupy the treasury benches. The evil is in the system. It tends to make men dishonest, insincere and corrupt.<sup>249</sup>

Hear, hear, from the Rouge[s].<sup>250</sup>

[MR. GAMBLE:] We never shall have such a government as we need till a radical change is made in our constitution.<sup>251</sup>

An honble. member cried "there is a tory for you."<sup>252</sup>

[MR. GAMBLE:] The hon. gentleman says "Tory." I am a republican, but not a democrat. I would sooner be that twenty times than----, but to the subject.<sup>253</sup>

An hon. member here cried out something about the legal<sup>254</sup> [OR] league bill.<sup>255</sup>

[MR. GAMBLE:] Among the good things promised us by the administration is a reform of the law. Most gentlemen of this House will remember the time of the League. They will remember the loud call for reform some years ago. The great fault was in our statute book.<sup>256</sup> Legal reforms ... had not been obtained; he hoped the hint given in the speech was the for[e]runner of reform, though he could not say what chance there was of reform in a House numbering at l[e]ast fifty lawyers.<sup>257</sup> They surely should be the last to find fault with the law. Until the publication of the index it was impossible to tell whether the law was bad or good. Since its issue this fault, to a certain extent, has been removed.<sup>258</sup> He spoke of the evils under which they had labored under the principle of statute law previously to the recent publication of the index, and the farther reforms necessary.<sup>259</sup> He hoped it

would not be long before we should see the fruits of what the ministry had promised. A word as regards the state of the jails.<sup>260</sup> The ... subject was one which imperatively demanded the attention of the Administration.<sup>261</sup> He said that the jail in this county was considered the best in Canada, and yet in the execution of his duties as magistrate he found it very difficult to find proper places for confinement of<sup>262</sup> offenders to be committed for the first offence. It was a shame to send such into such a crowded den of criminals to be taught new modes of crime.<sup>263</sup> If such was the state of accommodation in that jail, what must it not be [in] the other jails in the Province?<sup>264</sup> Next came a proposal for a measure to reform Juvenile offenders. He believed a grant had been made for this purpose some years ago but was not made use of. He was delighted that the present Administration had taken up this reform, because it was one of which the people felt the necessity.<sup>265</sup> He hoped the House would give the administration credit for bringing forward this most important measure. He was quite sure that a proper reform in this respect would be beneficial to this country.<sup>266</sup> Next there was the Police Bill. He felt that the Police was necessary. He knew there was a large number of sympathizers with murderers and other criminals; but he was not one of them, nor did he desire to live among a community filled with them. The only way in which crime could be rooted out was by a police force, such as that proposed by the Government. They were not particularly pugnacious in Upper Canada; but still they were not in that happy, primeval state of innocence of the people described lately, in such glowing terms, by the member for Arthabaska, where the people did not even know the name of a row. He feared that happy valley did not extend very far, however. He read an account of a tax riot in Chateauguay, a place not so very far from happy Arthabaska, in a newspaper; and, on the other page, in a place on the other side of the valley, he had read of the St. Sylvester murder. The country was much indebted to the Ministry, both for their past acts and for what they had promised now<sup>267</sup>. So long as they present before us measures which I, said the speaker, feel to be for the good of the country, so long will I give them a free and independent support.<sup>268</sup> He had given it last session--he should continue it. He had no personal end to serve, and no personal object in view. He only sought faithfully to represent his constituents, and to do his country good service. He had opposed the Ministry last session on the Clergy Reserves, Seignorial Tenure question; and the Separate School Bill. He had believed these measures wrong, and, as so much had been said in the course of the debate concerning the last, he would say a few words also. He held no ill will against the Roman Catholics. God forbid (*sic*) that he should hold ill will against men who worshipped the same God and believed in the same Saviour. He would engage in no religious controversy; but when<sup>269</sup> the Catholic Bishop of Toronto ... [dictated] to members of his church how they should exercise their political franchise,<sup>270</sup> it became a political not a religious question. He had always opposed Separate Schools as altogether unnecessary, but after they were recognised in the statute book, he had determined to take no steps to refute what had been done. He had resisted, and should resist, any attempt to extend the system;<sup>271</sup> yet he was satisfied to let matters rest as they were, if no further aggressive movements were made by the Roman Catholics.<sup>272</sup> In regard to the member for Carleton, he did not wonder that he had spoken somewhat warmly in reply to the aspersions of the hon. member for Montreal on the hon. and learned member for Toronto, whom the hon. member and himself acted with. Reference had been made to a meeting held in this city by some members thinking with the hon. and learned member, and some misapprehension prevailed respecting its objects. That meeting was not held to raise up any opposition to the present Government, but was an interchange of opinion among members who generally acted together, principally to decide upon the course to be taken on the Separate School question. The member for Carleton, in saying he supported the

Ministry only as a political necessity, went farther than he (Mr. Gamble,) or his hon. and learned friend from Toronto, or those who generally acted with them were prepared to go. They could give the Ministers a more hearty support than that, but could not endure the feeling displayed by the member for Carleton, in view of the newspaper attacks directed against his hon. and learned friend from Toronto. For his part while he endeavored to have the good opinion of good men he should endeavor to do his duty, quite irrespective of newspaper articles.<sup>273</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE (in French) said he thought it best, perhaps that he should follow the example of other gentlemen and define the position he occupied in the House with respect to Ministers and the Opposition.<sup>274</sup> [He] was always of what was called the Reform party--and<sup>275</sup> had been returned to Parliament in opposition to the late Administration. The characters of several of its members had been assailed in the public prints and the accusations thus made public had come to be believed. He came to Parliament to oppose them and they were defeated and driven from office.<sup>276</sup> Mais en dépit des charges qui s'élevaient contre le cabinet, malgré mes principes libéraux, plusieurs membres du gouvernement possédaient ma confiance. Lors du démembrement de l'administration dernière, lorsque je vis plusieurs libéraux s'allier à ceux qui, de tout temps, avaient été connus comme Torys, pour former un nouveau cabinet, je commençai à douter et j'étudiai attentivement la marche des affaires.<sup>277</sup> [He] regarded it with a suspicious eye. He thought the Tory element in it would absorb the Reform.<sup>278</sup> But when he saw them come down with the measures for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, and the Elective Legislative Council, he felt convinced that they were under the dominion of Toryism, but that the Conservative members of the Government had become Reformers. He had thenceforward afforded them an independent (*sic*) support and intended to do so in future.... When he looked to the measures of reform which the present Government had brought forward, he saw that they were brought forward by men calling themselves great Conservatives, and he was pleased to observe of them that they had proved good Reformers, as they have conducted the affairs of the country for the good of the country. As a general rule he should support the present Government, at the same time he wished it to be understood that he should render them a staunch support. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman then made some observations on some of the articles of the public press and to those who had chosen improperly to call those principles by which he was actuated in question--to such he had but one reply,<sup>279</sup> which was that he should still please himself. Again he had been charged with having no principle in gaining the support which he did, to such he would reply that the question which he put to himself was, were these measures of the Government Reform measures, and were they for the good of the country, as his principles had ever been to look to measures more than to men. (Hear, hear.)<sup>280</sup> Quel que soit le nom donné à l'administration, elle est en faveur des mesures libérales, et c'est ce qui m'a engagé à lui donner mon appui. J'agis en cela conformément aux désirs de mes commettants qui, dans plusieurs de leurs réunions, ont particulièrement désigné quelques membres du cabinet comme possédant toute leur confiance.<sup>281</sup>

Une voix de la montagne.--Lesquels?<sup>282</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE.--Je puis citer entr'autres, messieurs Cauchon et Drummond. J'ai cru devoir définir ainsi ma position, et l'ayant fait, je reprendrais ma place, si je n'avais encore à relever deux phrases du député de Lambton.<sup>283</sup> He (the Speaker) was much surprised the other night at the remarks of the honorable member for Lambton when the honorable and gallant knight had moved the adjournment of the

debate, the honorable member for Lambton chose to lecture him upon that course, telling him that the country would place the responsibility of such loss of time to the account of the Government<sup>284</sup>. Such remark came with very bad grace from the honorable member for Lambton who had occupied the time of the House for full five hours; and as there were 132 members who were each entitled to take share in that debate, should they do so, and occupy the same time as the hon. member for Lambton, the result would be 660 hours or 81 days, and taking only five days in the week it would require 111 days for the subject of the speech to be fully discussed upon the principle which the member for Lambton had adopted, and this would cost the country from 60,000L to 70,000L.<sup>285</sup> Espérons toutefois que les autres membres se montreront plus modestes que celui pour Lambton. (Rires.)<sup>286</sup> The hon. member is the proprietor of a great planet called the Globe; but fortunately for all of us this great planet of which the hon. member for Lambton is proprietor is a Globe of paper. (Loud laughter). The hon. member for Lambton had charged the Roman Catholic members of that House with having voted away thousands of pounds of Provincial Funds for the support of their church, at the same time the hon. gentleman was well aware that they had not voted a single penny for such purpose<sup>287</sup>. L'hon. représentant ne peut pas, en effet, être taxé d'ignorance sur la plupart de ces questions; d'un autre côté, je ne saurais lui dire qu'il a voulu induire la Chambre en erreur; mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que le Clergé catholique n'a jamais rien coûté à la Province<sup>288</sup>. The Roman clergy in Lower Canada ... were supported by the members of their own Church, who gave 1-26th part of their net revenue for this purpose. (Cheers.)<sup>289</sup> This too the hon. gentleman was aware of from a pamphlet in his hand when he made that speech.... I deny that we have ever sought to receive one penny, and I trust the hon. gentleman will not dispute this.<sup>290</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Vous avez tort.<sup>291</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE.--Je puis, M. l'Orateur (sic), prouver à l'hon. membre que c'est lui et lui seul qui se trompe et je n'aurai pas à chercher bien loin mes arguments lorsqu'il voudra ramener la discussion sur ce terrain. Quant à ce qu'il a dit de l'immoralité et de l'ignorance des peuples guidés par le Clergé catholique, je laisse cette accusation aux soins du représentant d'Iberville, des membres français qui se rangent autour du député de Lambton et de tous les représentants du Haut-Canada qui envoient leurs enfants aux collèges du Bas-Canada. Un autre député, celui de Haldimand, nous a rappelé que nous n'étions plus à Québec et que nous n'étions plus obligés de faire ce qui nous déplaisait. J'aimerais à savoir ce que l'hon. membre a pu faire à Québec contre sa volonté.<sup>292</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE.--Non pas moi, mais d'autres députés.<sup>293</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE.--Je ne crois pas, M. l'Orateur, que l'hon. membre parle sérieusement. Au moment de reprendre ma place, je me rappelle que certains membres se plaisent à me donner l'épithète de loose fish; mais cela ne m'effraie guère; je vois parmi eux des hommes qu'ils honorent et qui ont porté fièrement cette appellation, les députés de Sherbrooke et de Montréal, par exemple, (MM. Galt et Holton.) Je suis donc certain de me trouver placé, dans tous les cas, en bonne compagnie. (Rires et applaud.)<sup>294</sup>

MR. POULIOT spoke at some length, partly in French and partly in English, going over much the same ground as previous speakers.<sup>295</sup> M. l'Orateur, on en revient toujours au passé; la gauche nous dit à perdre haleine: Vous êtes en faveur d'une administration de Torys. Je ne veux pas savoir ce que c'est qu'un tory ou un

libéral. La lettre tue, M. l'Orateur, mais l'esprit vivifie. Or, quel est l'esprit du cabinet, quel que soit d'ailleurs le nom sous lequel il figure dans l'histoire? Ses mesures ne sont-elles pas au plus haut point libérales? Et pourtant, l'opposition veut que je les rejette, parce qu'elles viennent d'un tory. Timco Torys et dona ferentes, nous dit-elle à chaque instant; craignons les Torys et les dons qu'ils nous font. Mais, pour moi, je ne crains rien; j'accepte les bonnes lois qui me viennent d'un Tory d'aussi bon coeur que je refuserais les mesures tyranniques proposées par une administration de démocrates purs. Les membres de la gauche n'en feraient pas autant, sans doute, et dans tous les cas ils prétendent que le pavillon couvre la marchandise.<sup>296</sup> He attacked Mr. Brown for his attacks on Roman Catholics, and Mr. Dorion for furnishing him with the means of attack by depreciating education in Lower Canada.<sup>297</sup> Je ne prendrai pas la peine, M. l'Orateur, de repousser les calomnies lancées contre ma religion par les deux membres qui flanquent, l'un à droite et l'autre à gauche, le député de Montréal. En effet, le représentant de Lambton peut demander à son collègue de Kent s'il est vrai que les Catholiques soient ignorants et immoraux; et le député de Haldimand, qui parle sans cesse de la mauvaise organisation du Bas-Canada, ferait mieux de songer à son esprit qui me fait l'effet d'une Babel, à cause, non de la confusion des langues, mais de celle des idées.<sup>298</sup> He called ... upon all Upper Canada members to say how they had been treated at Quebec. [He then] ... proceeded to comment on the Governor General's Hamilton speech, saying that comparing all His Excellency's speeches, they could not imagine he meant any insult to French Canadian nationality. Why, if he preached union at Cobourg, had he preached disunion at Hamilton?<sup>299</sup>--

[MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER] called [the gentleman] to order for having mentioned the Representative of Her Majesty<sup>300</sup>.

[MR. POULIOT] sat down.<sup>301</sup>

MR. PAPIN spoke on the opposite side, ... in French<sup>302</sup>: M. l'Orateur,--Beaucoup de différens sujets ont été traités par les hon. membres qui ont parlé avant moi; on a surtout beaucoup parlé de religion, chose que je m'abstiendrai entièrement de faire, car je crois que rien ne serait plus regrettable que de voir introduire dans cette chambre des discussions religieuses qui ne pourraient avoir d'autre effet que d'exciter les mauvaises passions, les haines et les préjugés. Quand j'ai commencé, l'autre jour, les remarques que je me propose maintenant de continuer, j'ai fait voir que l'hon. secrétaire provincial avait travesti les paroles de mon honorable ami pour la cité de Montréal, dans le but de faire croire qu'il avait insulté ses compatriotes, tandis qu'il n'avait fait que reprocher au gouvernement son indifférence coupable et sa négligence par rapport à l'éducation du Bas-Canada.

Je ferai maintenant quelques observations sur les différens sujets mentionnés dans le discours de son excellence, et sur la manière dont la discussion a été conduite jusqu'à ce moment. Tous les membres de l'administration et tous leurs amis qui ont pris la parole, ont concentré leurs efforts pour essayer de prouver que les différens membres qui composent l'opposition ne s'accordent pas sur toutes les questions d'intérêt public. Et ils en ont invariablement tiré la conclusion que l'opposition ne pourrait pas, avec ces élémens divers, composer un ministère et gouverner le pays. Je demande à prendre acte de cet argument en faveur de l'opposition. C'est une admission de la part des hon. membres de l'autre côté de la chambre, de la sincérité et de la consistance qu'ils sont obligés de reconnaître dans les membres de l'opposition. Car ils ne nous diraient pas que nos différences d'opinion peuvent nous empêcher de former un gouvernement, s'ils croyaient que nous fussions capables, dans le but d'obtenir le pouvoir, de sacrifier et mettre de côté nos principes et

nos opinions politiques, comme l'ont fait ceux qui sont aujourd'hui assis sur les banquettes ministérielles. L'hon. membre pour Laprairie a surtout parlé beaucoup de cette division qu'il a traduit en incapacité de la part de l'opposition. Il doit pourtant se rappeler qu'à l'ouverture de la session de 1854, il avait préparé un discours foudroyant contre sir Allan McNab et ses amis qui étaient alors une section de l'opposition, et que dans l'intervalle sir Allan McNab étant monté au pouvoir, il lui adressa tous les éloges qu'il avait préparés pour M. Hincks et a adressé aux membres de l'opposition qui ne s'étaient pas vendus pour un portefeuille, les foudres qu'il avait préparées contre sir Allan McNab et ses amis. Les membres ministériels du Bas-Canada doivent se rappeler qu'après la résignation du ministère Hincks ils se sont assemblés, sans avoir leurs chefs avec eux, et ont décidé unanimement de ne pas accepter l'alliance du parti tory dans le cas où elle leur serait offerte. Mais le lend[e]main matin leurs chefs vinrent les informer que la transaction était faite, que le bargain était conclu, et avec la même unanimité tous s'engagèrent à supporter sir Allan McNab et Cie. Qui douterait, après un pareil exemple, que si mon hon. ami pour la cité de Montréal traversait la chambre pour aller s'asseoir dans le fauteuil du procureur-général Est, si son collègue, M. Holton, allait prendre possession du siège actuellement occupé par l'hon. inspecteur-général, si même l'hon. membre pour Lambton remplaçait l'hon. commissaire des terres de la couronne; qui douterait, dis-je, que ces hon. messieurs n'eussent l'appui cordial et dévoué de l'hon. membre pour Laprairie et de ses amis? Pour moi je n'en ai aucun doute, M. l'Orateur; leur conduite passée m'est un garant de leur conduite future; car avant l'ascension de sir Allan McNab, ils lui étaient aussi hostiles qu'ils le sont aujourd'hui à l'hon. membre pour Lambton. Tous avaient promis sur les hustings, de combattre le parti tory et de l'anéantir s'il était possible, et leur premier acte en chambre a été un vote de confiance dans sir Allan McNab. Qui pourrait douter, après cela, qu'avec une chambre ainsi composée, il y ait une combinaison possible qui n'aurait pas la majorité, si elle était appelée à gouverner le pays? Mais, M. l'Orateur, s'il y a des différences d'opinion dans l'opposition, je ferai observer que l'opposition n'est pas tenue de s'accorder sur tous les points, car chacun de ses membres n'est responsable que de sa propre opinion, et l'opposition n'est pas responsable au pays des mesures que la majorité adopte ou rejette. Il n'en est pas ainsi du gouvernement. Du moment qu'il y a division dans ses rangs sur des questions importantes, comme la chose existe aujourd'hui, le pays en souffre, car on laisse de côté toute législation sur ces grandes questions, ou on en fait des questions ouvertes, ce qui produit à peu près le même résultat. C'est ainsi que le pays vient d'encourir une dépense de cent vingt-cinq mille louis<sup>303</sup> [OU] 150,000L<sup>304</sup> pour transporter le siège du gouvernement de Québec à Toronto, et cela parce que les ministres étant divisés sur cette question, et n'ayant pas le patriotisme de sacrifier des intérêts de localité à l'intérêt général, en ont fait une question ouverte. Ils n'ont pas eu la force ni le courage de prendre sur cette question, une position telle que le pays avait droit de s'y attendre, et l'on en souffre aujourd'hui les conséquences funestes. Voilà ce que peut produire la division dans un ministère, voilà les conséquences d'une coalition formée d'éléments hétérogènes. Et ce n'est pas là la seule question importante sur laquelle ces hon. messieurs diffèrent.<sup>305</sup> Non content de ne pas faire ce qui est demandé par le peuple, le ministère fait ce qui n'est pas du tout demandé,--et pourtant il prend les divisions de l'opposition pour excuse. Il propose un bill de police qui est répudié par tout le pays, et quelle est son excuse? Toujours la même; c'est que l'opposition n'est pas unie. Mais le ministère n'est pas plus uni que l'opposition.<sup>306</sup> N'avons-nous pas entendu l'hon. membre pour Québec, en proposant la réponse au discours de son excellence, dire qu'il ne s'était fait élire que pour obtenir le chemin de fer du Nord, et qu'il ne supporterait l'administration

qu'à cette condition? Et malgré l'intérêt que portent à cette mesure presque tous les membres du district de Québec et des Trois-Rivières qui soutiennent l'administration, malgré l'intérêt de toute la population française qui habite le nord du St. Laurent et qui réclame hautement cette grande amélioration; malgré le mouvement prononcé qui s'est fait dernièrement dans Québec à ce sujet, et malgré les efforts qu'a fait l'hon. commissaire des terres de la couronne, malgré la part active qu'il a prise en faveur de cette mesure, quand il travaillait pour gagner la place qu'il occupe aujourd'hui; malgré tout cela, dis-je, non seulement cet important sujet n'a pas été mentionné dans le discours du trône, mais l'hon. commissaire des terres de la couronne n'a pas même daigné dire un seul mot à ce sujet dans le long discours qu'il vient de faire. Quelle est donc la cause de ce silence? C'est tout simple. D'un côté l'hon. commissaire des terres est en faveur du chemin de fer du Nord, mais de l'autre côté l'hon. secrétaire provincial, en sa qualité d'avocat du Grand Tronc, est obligé de s'y opposer dans l'intérêt de la compagnie qu'il représente; et de là inaction complète du ministère sur cette question, impossibilité d'en faire une mesure ministérielle; on en fera une question ouverte, la plus grande partie des ministres voteront contre et la mesure sera rejetée. Cela prouve encore ce que l'on peut attendre d'une administration qui ne s'accorde pas avec elle-même. Je crois que les ministres auraient bien mieux fait de justifier leur conduite, s'ils en étaient capables, que d'accuser l'opposition d'être divisée. Voici comment je résume leur argumentation: Nous ne sommes pas obligés de présenter les mesures que le pays réclame, parce que l'opposition est divisée; nous pouvons bien imposer au peuple des lois dont il ne veut pas, car l'opposition est divisée; en d'autres termes nous pouvons faire le mal et nous dispenser de faire le bien, parce qu'il y a différence d'opinion dans l'opposition et qu'elle ne peut pas prendre nos places à présent. Voici le raisonnement des ministres. Mais je doute fort que le pays s'accorde avec eux sur ce point. Et quand ils seront appelés à rendre compte de leurs actes, je pense qu'ils seront examinés sur ce qu'ils auront fait et omis de faire, et non pas sur ce que pensaient leurs adversaires. Alors peut-être ils feront des professions de foi et des protestations de bonne volonté, ils voudront se conformer à tout pour garder leurs places, mais le peuple leur répondra par le cri qui s'est déjà fait entendre dans d'autres circonstances. Il est trop tard.<sup>307</sup> Il a déjà condamné les tentatives des ministériels de faire un injuste reproche à M. Dorion, comme s'il avait calomnié ses compatriotes, et il n'en dira pas plus sur ce sujet. Cependant il doit remarquer qu'il est pénible de voir avec quelle légèreté le ministère pense et agit à propos de<sup>308</sup> [l'une] des mesures les plus importantes du jour et à laquelle le gouverneur réfère dans son discours, ... celle du conseil législatif électif. Quelle est la position du gouvernement sur cette question? Il est connu que tous les membres de l'administration sont de fait opposés à cette mesure, à l'exception peut-être de l'hon. commissaire des travaux publics et de l'hon. maître-général des postes. Ce qu'en ont dit plusieurs journaux ministériels dans le Haut et dans le Bas-Canada est certainement de nature à augmenter les craintes et les soupçons déjà existant auparavant, savoir: que le gouvernement ne désire pas l'introduction du principe électif dans le conseil législatif. Cette mesure a déjà été passée par la chambre et rejetée par le conseil. Il n'y a rien qui puisse porter à croire qu'il en sera autrement durant la présente session, et le gouvernement est blâmable, dans mon opinion, de n'avoir pris aucun moyen de conduire sa mesure à bonne fin quand il avait pour le garder l'expérience des procédés de l'année dernière. Le discours du gouverneur parle aussi de la tenure seigneuriale. Les ministres veulent nous faire approuver tout ce qui a été fait en vertu des actes passés durant la dernière session, sans que nous ayons aucune information sur le résultat ni même sur le progrès des ouvrages de la commission. Les décisions judiciaires ne sont pas encore rendues; nous ne savons pas s'il y a un seul cadastre de

fait, combien il y en a de commencés, en un mot nous sommes dans les ténèbres sur les travaux de la commission, comme nous l'étions quand le gouvernement faisait passer à trois heures du matin, contre la majorité du Bas-Canada, le bill seigneurial du conseil que nous n'avions pas eu le temps de lire. Et c'est sous ces circonstances que l'on veut nous faire approuver aveuglément tout ce qui a été fait depuis la dernière session. La preuve que nous avons raison d'être sur nos gardes et de ne pas nous prononcer avant d'avoir eu les informations que le gouvernement sera appelé à donner sous quelques jours, c'est qu'un journal ministériel qui passe pour être l'organe spécial de l'hon. secrétaire-provincial,<sup>309</sup> la Patrie,<sup>310</sup> a accusé la commission seigneuriale d'incapacité, de n'avoir fait aucun travail utile et d'avoir loué, aux frais de la province, une maison dont les commissaires n'auraient fait usage que pour donner des soirées et des divertissemens. Je ne puis, quant à moi, approuver la conduite du gouvernement avant d'avoir eu toutes les informations qu'il est obligé de donner à la chambre. Je comprends parfaitement que l'hon. membre pour Dorchester, qui a été employé pendant la vacance à faire des cadastres, pour lesquels il a sans doute été payé libéralement, trouve que le bill seigneurial fonctionne très bien; je conçois aussi que l'hon. membre pour Laprairie, qui a été employé pour préparer et plaider les questions seigneuriales qui ont été soumises au tribunal constitué à cet effet, et qui n'a pas dû faire ce travail gratuitement, soit d'opinion que l'acte seigneurial fonctionne à merveille, et que ces messieurs soient prêts à donner au gouvernement leur entière approbation sur ce point. Je comprends même que ceux des censitaires qui n'envisagent que le présent, voyant qu'ils ne paient maintenant que les rentes ordinaires, qu'ils ne paient plus de lods et ventes, peuvent être dans une sécurité complète, s'ils ne considèrent pas la rente qu'ils seront appelés à payer quand les cadastres seront terminés et que l'acte sera en pleine opération. Mais je pense que quand toutes les répartitions seront faites et que les censitaires connaîtront le véritable état dans lequel ils seront placés, le contentement sera loin d'être aussi général. Dans tous les cas, il serait imprudent de se prononcer dans le moment sur l'état de cette question. Le discours de son excellence fait aussi allusion aux réformes légales et judiciaires dont le besoin se fait sentir dans le Haut et le Bas Canada, mais il en parle d'une singulière manière. Il nous dit que nous ne pouvons pas faire tout ce que nous désirons à ce sujet. Que ferons-nous donc? Il me semble que l'hon. procureur-général Est devrait nous donner des explications à ce sujet. Le discours nous dit qu'il nous sera promis au moins une mesure. Sera-ce une mesure pour le Haut ou pour le Bas-Canada, ou pour les deux sections à la fois? C'est ce qu'il serait encore important de savoir.<sup>311</sup> Si ce n'est que pour une partie de la province, le bill ne contentera pas beaucoup l'autre.<sup>312</sup> Depuis longtemps le besoin de réformes radicales dans la judicature du Bas-Canada se fait sentir. Il faut la décentralisation des pouvoirs judiciaires; tout le monde le demande à grands cris. Dès l'ouverture de la session de 1854, l'hon. procureur-général, en réponse à une question faite au gouvernement, promit un bill de judicature: néanmoins il n'en présenta aucun durant cette longue session, et quelque temps avant la prorogation du parlement, nous apprîmes que le procureur-général Est ne pouvait présenter sa mesure avant d'aller dans la Louisiane étudier le fonctionnement du système judiciaire. Or, il est arrivé que le procureur-général est à peu près le seul de tous les ministres qui ne soit pas allé se promener à l'étranger durant la vacance. Et nous en sommes encore à attendre son grand bill de judicature promis depuis si longtemps; et Dieu sait jusqu'à quand nous l'attendrons.<sup>313</sup> De la même manière, le discours ne fait qu'une allusion à l'éducation, et abandonne le sujet sans rien proposer.<sup>314</sup> Mais ce qui ne se fera pas attendre c'est une mesure pour établir une police provinciale que le peuple n'a pas demandée et qu'il ne désire pas, parce qu'il n'en a pas besoin. Malgré tout ce qu'on a dit je suis entièrement opposé à l'établissement de cette police. Il n'y a aucun doute qu'une police est

nécessaire dans les villes et dans tous les grands centres de population, où trop souvent le conflit d'intérêts opposés des différentes origines et des différens partis qui viennent en contact est la cause de troubles, d'émeutes et de scènes déshonorantes. Mais je demanderai à tous les hon. membres qui, comme moi, représentent les campagnes, si la population de nos comtés a besoin d'une police provinciale pour la tenir dans l'ordre. Je ne pense pas que l'on pourrait citer un seul exemple qui justifierait une pareille mesure. Et dans tous les cas, ce ne serait que des exceptions. Il est bien vrai que l'hon. Premier a dit que cette police serait limitée aux villes si la majorité de la chambre en décidait ainsi. Mais même dans ce cas je prétends qu'il serait injuste de prendre les deniers publics qui appartiennent aux habitans des campagnes comme à ceux des villes, pour maintenir une police dont les villes seules auraient besoin. Dans toutes les villes il y a des autorités municipales bien organisées qui ont une police sous leur contrôle et qui sont les meilleurs juges des besoins de leurs localités et des dépenses et mesures nécessaires pour y maintenir l'ordre. C'est à ces autorités que l'on devrait laisser ce soin. Mais le gouvernement préfère avoir sous son contrôle une force sur laquelle il puisse s'appuyer dans les temps d'élections et au moyen de laquelle il pourra faire pencher la balance de son côté par l'intimidation et les manoeuvres qu'il saura employer. J'ai entendu l'hon. secrétaire-provincial dire qu'il n'avait pas encore été concerné dans l'élection de Montréal, mais qu'il pourrait bien l'être à la prochaine fois. Je ne serais pas surpris que cet hon. monsieur, considérant les nombreuses difficultés qu'il a rencontrées pour se faire élire la dernière fois qu'il s'est présenté dans le comté de Verchères, et sentant le terrain lui glisser sous les pieds, n'oserait plus se présenter à ses anciens électeurs, et qu'il serait tenté de jeter les yeux sur la cité de Montréal. Mais je puis l'assurer que tant qu'il tiendra une conduite semblable à celle qu'il a tenue depuis plusieurs années, il n'aura jamais l'honneur de représenter Montréal, à moins qu'il ne réussisse à s'y faire élire par la police qu'il aura créée, qu'il aura sous son contrôle et au moyen de laquelle il pourrait faire prévaloir la minorité sur la majorité.<sup>315</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER rit d'une manière bruyante.<sup>316</sup>

MR. PAPIN.--L'hon. membre peut rire, mais il ne riait pas tant à la dernière élection de Verchères, et il rira encore moins s'il se présente à Montréal.<sup>317</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--Je ris parce que c'est risible.<sup>318</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--A l'ordre!<sup>319</sup>

MR. PAPIN.--Je comprends, M. l'orateur, que ces mots: à l'ordre, ne s'adressent pas à moi.<sup>320</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER fait un signe négatif.<sup>321</sup>

MR. PAPIN.--Afin de ne plus mettre l'hon. secrétaire provincial dans la nécessité de se faire rappeler à l'ordre, je vais le laisser tranquille avec sa police.

Je ne pourrais passer sous silence les remarques qui sont tombées de la bouche de l'hon. membre qui est censé représenter le comté de Laprairie. Il a été assez imprudent et il s'est risqué au point de dire que sur certaine question, il représentait non seulement le comté de Laprairie, mais qu'il croyait représenter le grand parti national du Bas-Canada. Il a demandé hardiment quel travail l'opinion publique avait fait dans le Bas-Canada en faveur de l'opposition, depuis la dernière session. Je me contenterai, pour répondre à cette question, de le référer à une

assemblée qui a [eu] lieu dans le comté de Laprairie, à St. Philippe, le cinq décembre dernier. Qu'il étudie les procédés de cette assemblée et il pourra se convaincre du travail qu'a fait l'opinion. Il a dit qu'il serait probablement encore accusé de servilité, comme il l'avait déjà été. Il doit savoir que s'il a été accusé de servilité, ce n'est pas par nous, mais par ses électeurs. Il doit savoir qu'à cette assemblée de son comté, convoquée longtemps d'avance dans les journaux de Montréal, ses électeurs ont résolu: "Que par sa conduite servile il avait perdu leur confiance et qu'en conséquence il ait à changer de conduite ou à leur remettre son mandat." Et cette résolution est l'expression spontanée de l'opinion de ses électeurs, dépouillée de toute influence étrangère. Ce ne sont pas les rouges de Montréal qui, comme on les en a accusés quelquefois, sont allés agiter l'opinion publique dans le comté de Laprairie, mais ce sont ses électeurs qui, seuls, laissés à eux-mêmes, ont organisé cette assemblée et en sont venus à cette détermination sur le compte de leur représentant. L'hon. membre peut maintenant juger du progrès de l'opinion publique au moins dans son comté. Je croirais, M. l'orateur, manquer aux égards qui sont dus à l'hon. commissaire des terres de la couronne, si je ne lui disais un mot en réplique. L'hon. membre, suivant la route que lui avait tracée ses amis, s'est comme eux attaché à signaler les différences d'opinion qu'il dit exister dans les rangs de l'opposition. Il a surtout attaqué sévèrement l'hon. membre pour Lambton à qui il a reproché d'être seul, et il a ajouté qu'il était accoutumé à se trouver seul de son opinion. Il peut se faire qu'en effet l'hon. membre pour Lambton ait des opinions qui ne sont pas partagées par un grand nombre de membres de cette chambre. Mais il n'a pas toujours été ainsi seul et isolé. L'hon. commissaire des terres de la couronne doit se rappeler que quand il combattait vaillamment dans la presse et dans les rangs de l'opposition pour gagner la place qu'il occupe aujourd'hui, il occupait un siège à côté de l'hon. membre pour Lambton, et en référant au journal de la chambre de 1852 et 53 que je tiens dans ma main, l'on voit que sur presque toutes les questions ces deux messieurs votaient ensemble et s'accordaient parfaitement. Presque toutes les divisions que j'y vois contiennent leurs noms accolés l'un à l'autre. Mais il est surtout une circonstance particulière dans laquelle leur union intime est prouvée d'une manière frappante. Je lis dans le rapport des procédés de la séance du 25 février 1853:

"L'ordre du jour pour la seconde lecture du bill pour amender les lois relatives à l'université de Toronto, en séparant ses fonctions, comme université, de celles qui lui sont assignées comme collège, et en établissant de meilleures dispositions pour l'administration de sa dotation et de celle du collège du Haut-Canada, étant lu;

"L'hon. M. Hincks a proposé, secondé par l'hon. M. Rolph, et la question ayant été mise, que le bill soit maintenant lu une seconde fois; la chambre s'est divisée; et les noms ayant été demandés, ils ont été pris comme suit:"

Ici, M. l'orateur, je trouve en faveur de la proposition 58 noms, ce qui était presque toute la chambre d'alors ou au moins presque tous les membres présents. Et qu'est-ce que je trouve contre? Deux noms seulement. Or quels sont donc ces deux hommes qui sont tellement liés ensemble qu'ils se trouvent ainsi seuls en opposition à toute la chambre? Quels sont donc ces deux hommes qui, quand tous les partis s'unissent pour supporter une mesure du gouvernement, s'insurgent, pour ainsi dire, contre la volonté de toute la chambre, et font ce que l'hon. commissaire des terres appellerait aujourd'hui une opposition factieuse? Quels sont-ils? Ce sont messieurs Brown et Cauchon; les deux inséparables, les deux intimes, arcades ambo. Ils n'ont pas pu, quand toute la chambre s'accordait sur cette question, se séparer l'un de l'autre, même aux risques de voter seuls, tant leur union était étroite. Et ce qu'il y a de plus extraordinaire, c'est que M. Cauchon se

tenait ainsi à M. Brown, sur une question religieuse concernant le Haut-Canada. Quel était donc le lien qui les unissait ainsi? Doit-on dire que c'était les extrêmes qui se touchaient? Je ne le pense pas. Je crois que c'était plutôt la communauté des principes ou une sympathie naturelle qui les entraînaient l'un vers l'autre d'une manière irrésistible. Mais aujourd'hui les tems sont changés. L'hon. commissaire des terres, non content d'avoir abandonné le drapeau de l'hon. membre pour Lambton, d'avoir lâchement déserté ses principes, pousse la cruauté jusqu'à reprocher à son ancien compagnon d'infortune l'isolement dans lequel sa propre désertion l'a placé. C'est certainement peu généreux de sa part.<sup>322</sup> S'il y a quelqu'un qui mérite des sympathies dans sa situation, c'est certainement le membre pour Lambton, qui a été sacrifié si cruellement par le membre pour Montmorency. Ces mêmes messieurs étaient ensemble lors du vote qui fit tomber le dernier ministère.<sup>323</sup> Personne, M. l'orateur, ne se rappelle mieux que vous ce qui s'est passé en juin 1854. L'hon. membre pour Montmorency, (M. Cauchon), ne s'est-il pas entendu alors avec M. Brown et avec ses amis; tous deux ne se sont-ils pas entendus avec vous; et n'avez-vous pas, par vos efforts réunis, réussi à défaire l'administration par un vote qui a été immédiatement ratifié par le peuple. L'hon. commissaire des terres a-t-il, avant de donner ce vote, considéré s'il s'accordait sur toutes les questions politiques avec vous et avec son honorable ami pour Lambton? Et n'étiez-vous pas alors tous ensemble justifiables de renverser une administration en qui vous n'aviez pas confiance, quoique vous pussiez différer entre vous sur plusieurs points?<sup>324</sup> D'ailleurs, il est bien connu que ces deux messieurs se consultèrent privément ensemble en cette occasion et que le membre pour Montmorency fut assez complaisant pour changer, sous certains rapports, sa motion d'amendement afin de rencontrer les vues de l'hon. membre pour Lambton.<sup>325</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said, the resolution was only seconded by him, being proposed by the Speaker.<sup>326</sup>

[MR. PAPIN:] On m'assure que ce n'est pas la seule question sur laquelle ces deux honorables messieurs se sont ainsi trouvés à voter seuls, mais je n'ai pas les autres sous la main pour le moment. Il y avait une autre grande question sur laquelle ils s'accordaient parfaitement alors. Tous deux étaient opposés à l'introduction du principe électif dans le conseil législatif; tous deux ont voté plus d'une fois ensemble contre ce principe. Mais sur cette question encore l'hon. commissaire des terres a abandonné son ancien ami. Et si l'hon. membre pour Lambton s'est trouvé à voter seul dans la dernière session, avec trois ou quatre autres, contre le conseil législatif électif, c'est encore parce que l'hon. commissaire des terres l'avait trahi. Maintenant je le demande: lequel de ces deux messieurs est dans une position plus enviable devant le public? Est-ce celui qui fait preuve de sincérité et de consistance en votant aujourd'hui comme il le faisait alors, ou bien celui qui a tout sacrifié pour monter au pouvoir, et qui a vendu ses principes pour un portefeuille?... Comme je l'ai dit, l'hon. commissaire des terres aurait dû se rappeler sa conduite passée, avant de parler des divisions qu'il voit dans l'opposition, et avant de reprocher avec amertume à son ancien ami l'isolement dans lequel lui-même l'a placé en sacrifiant ses principes pour monter au pouvoir. Je me contenterai, M. l'orateur, de ces remarques générales sur le discours du gouverneur et sur la discussion qui s'en est suivie, persuadé que chaque membre aura plus tard l'occasion d'exprimer ses opinions sur chaque mesure qui sera présentée séparément.<sup>327</sup>

MR. A. MORRISON, said he could not let the debate close without making a few observations. On Thursday last the hon. member for Lambton, made an attack on him,

in connection with several other Reform members on his side of the house. That hon. gentleman was pleased to say that in case a government were formed by the gentlemen on his side of the house, he (Mr. M.) dare not hold the principles which he then professed. But he wished to tell him that<sup>328</sup> under no circumstances would he ever vote for or support Mr. Brown or any Ministry that gentleman might form<sup>329</sup>. He (Mr. M.) was well acquainted with the antecedents of the hon. member for Lambton and would never pursue a course diametrically opposite to that which he (Mr. M.) had always followed, and of which he had been returned to that house by his constituents as an advocate. They had confidence in his integrity, and when called on by them to be their representative, he accepted that call. He now felt proud in declaring himself to be a Reformer, as he had ever done. It was as an upholder of Reform principles he had been returned to that House by his constituents and he would ever advocate Reform. He felt proud in being returned to that house by the constituency (sic) which he had the honor to represent--a constituency that had such unswerving faith in his integrity that they had not exacted from him a single pledge. He did, however, on his election, pledge himself to advocate one question, and that was the Clergy Reserves. And he had kept his pledge on that subject. He had done his duty faithfully to his constituents (sic) in that matter, and defied any one to assert the contrary. As to the false statements which the hon. member for Lambton had attributed to him, he would only say that that hon. gentleman might place his name in black letters in the columns of his organ as long as he pleased. Since that hon. gentleman had deserted his principles, he had ever opposed him and would still continue to do so. He (Mr. M.) went down to Quebec last session, in order to disabuse the public mind of the falsehoods so industriously propagated by the member for Lambton. He felt that the sentiments of that hon. gentleman had more or less corrupted the minds of the people in distant parts of the Province. With this object he went down to Quebec. And when the address had been delivered, he carefully weighed it, and on doing so, found himself compelled to support that Administration. But alas, that Administration lasted but a very short time. And he would ask in his (the member for Lambton's) endeavors to upset that Administration, was he consistent with his principles? Not he. His ambition was to be Premier--he attempted to break down the late Government, solely for the purpose of placing himself and his followers on the treasury benches. He (Mr. M.) opposed that hon. gentleman and supported the Administration, which upheld the principles he had been returned to advocate. He did not follow the selfish course pursued by the hon. member for Lambton; but being determined to adhere to his principles, he did his duty faithfully and consistently and supported that Administration.<sup>330</sup> He went to Quebec as an independent and reform member; but he believed the coalition Ministry was called together to carry the reform measures which the people demanded; and he therefore supported it, and would heartily support it still.<sup>331</sup> The hon. gentleman, in a speech of much eloquence and power then reviewed his political career as an unswerving advocate of Reform principles, with which he contrasted the recreancy of Mr. Brown, in deserting the principles to which he had solemnly pledged himself.<sup>332</sup> Having found himself described by the member for Lambton as a recreant Liberal, [he] proceeded to show that, acting on the principles enunciated by Mr. Brown in 1851, he had agreed to sacrifice his personal predilections for the accomplishment of great measures of political utility. He went on to read from published speeches, to show but that the other year, Mr. Brown was the eulogist of French Canadian virtue--the defender of party Government, and the avowed advocate of political compromises.<sup>333</sup> He opposed Mr. Brown for his inconsistency, and referred to the Haldimand election. This led him to produce a handbill which Mr. Brown had published in opposition to Mr. Mackenzie, when he offered himself at Haldimand.<sup>334</sup> He asked the member for Haldimand whether Mr. Brown was not the tool of the Baldwin Government in 1851<sup>335</sup>.

MR. MACKENZIE ... [said] he couldn't remember.<sup>336</sup>

[MR. A. MORRISON resumed:] He approved of the doctrines Mr. Brown then advocated; but he held that he (Mr. M.) still adhered to these doctrines. While he contended that Mr. Brown had changed the principles which he then professed, he admitted the Globe was a well conducted journal in a commercial and intellectual point of view; but the editorials, he condemned them; yet it was by that black and white sheet alone, and not by moral character, or any other power, that Mr. B. maintained his influence. He commented at some length on the hand-bill, and said he might be thought to have made too exclusive and personal an attack on Mr. B.; but he held that he had a right to do so since the Globe had latterly been attacking him very frequently.<sup>337</sup> In conclusion the hon. gentleman stated that any measures brought forward by the present Administration, which would benefit the country at large, should always command his support.<sup>338</sup> He professed his confidence in the good intentions of the Ministry, whom he would support so long as they continued in that course, reserving himself, however, on the Police Bill.<sup>339</sup>

MR. FREEMAN said at that late period of the evening and the debate, it was not his intention to offer to the House any lengthy remarks--more especially as it had been remarked that the Opposition had uselessly occupied the valuable time of the House at great expense to the funds of the country.<sup>340</sup> One remark in his Excellency's Speech had provoked the chief part of the discussion that had arisen, and on that discussion the Administration had taken the liberty of saying that the Opposition members had expended an unreasonable amount of time. But it was the Administration themselves, who by introducing that topic, had provoked discussion on it. He asked what object the Administration could have had in asking members on his side, who, they knew well, had acted from principle when they opposed the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question, as it was settled in a manner inconsistent with the principles they had advocated for years and years--he asked how they could have expected that that side of the House would join in congratulating the country on a settlement of the question directly opposed to what they had always contended for. But the leader of the Government had very indiscreetly told the House why that was put into the Speech from the throne, and the reason, he thought, was not very creditable to the Government. He said it was put in for the purpose of provoking a discussion. When that declaration went to the country, it would not be the Opposition that would be held accountable for any time that had been consumed in discussing that part of the Speech.--(Hear, hear.) The Government might say as much as they pleased as to their indifference to the opposition that had been raised by the hon. member for Lambton against their policy. He apprehended, however, that the country had too much discrimination not to see that all the artillery the Administration had brought to bear, both great and small, down to the little pocket pistols--(laughter,)--all had been aimed against the hon. member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.) He was of opinion that from the direction of their fire, it might be seen where the Government apprehended danger, and he apprehended that it was from the seat which that hon. member occupied. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. Postmaster General stated that the member for Lambton had not shown in what way the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question was wrong. Now he thought he could show quite a distinction between the mode in which the question had been settled, and the mode in which it had been agitated by the country, at all events by the persons who held views in accordance with those of the majority of the Reformers in this House. The Postmaster General reiterated to-day the declaration he made at Quebec in reference to this question. He declared that the settlement would not be worth anything that did not contain the principle of commutation, and that the country at large had never

made it a question of pounds, shillings and pence, but a religious question, a question between the church and state and the voluntary principle. He could not agree with the hon. Postmaster General in that proposition, that the country never made it a question of money. He denied that, and the hon. gentleman himself afforded an argument to disprove the allegation he had made, for he hoped to justify the position the Government had taken up, and to satisfy the people of the country, by the large sum of money they were to receive out of the settlement. His hoping to satisfy the people with that showed that the Government did feel it was a question of money, as well as a question of principle. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. gentleman went further and said that the view taken of the question by the Government was this, that they did not wish to see one denomination obtain a bounty which others did not; that they did not wish to see any distinction made between one church and another. He asked whether they could say that the wish of the country in this respect had been carried out, when they looked at the effect of this legislation, and saw one or two churches receiving large amounts out of the Clergy Reserves for the purpose of a perpetual endowment? (Hear, hear.) The hon. Premier had said that, when he found public opinion was overwhelming on one side of the question, that there was the whole House against (sic) 20 or 30 votes, that he felt it useless for him longer to adhere to his former principles on that question--and that he resolved not to abandon them but to do the best possible in the circumstances, by making the best settlement of the matter that he could. And what was that? It was to kick out a Reform Administration on a hollow profession of continued hostility to that measure, to take the reins in his own hands, and to bring the Clergy Reserves just to such a point as he could lead a majority of the members of this House to support him to, and that was the settlement! (Hear, hear.) In reference to the various other measures mentioned in the Speech from the throne he did not intend to say much. But as regarded the policy of the Government he had one further remark as to its originality. When those hon. gentlemen went to the country, after their acceptance of office, he asked on what principle did they run? or could they take credit for being returned on any principle or policy of their own whatever? (Hear, hear.) He doubted very much whether their constituents understood that the Government were to settle the Reserve question as they did. He questioned much if the Postmaster General had told the people of Wentworth that the Bill to be brought in was not the Bill foreshadowed by the former Administration, but that it was to have an important clause added, securing to some particular churches a larger revenue than they were entitled to, he questioned much whether he would have received the support he did. But, however that might be, it was a fact that in his electioneering speeches he did not give the people to understand that that was the character of the Bill to be ... forward. Perhaps, now that the thing was ... the hon. gentleman's constituents were satisfied with the way in which the question had been settled, but he denied it to be the fact that the country had been so agitated, that, as the hon. gentleman remarked, they wanted it settled for God's sake; he denied that their anxiety to have it settled was greater than their anxiety as to the mode of settlement. (Hear, hear.) In reference to the measures mentioned in the speech as intended to be introduced by the Government, he would not now occupy the time of the House, as they could be best dealt with when they were put in possession of the details. But he must make two or three remarks more on the speech of the Postmaster General. The hon. gentleman had indulged to a very great extent in that line of argument which had been too much made use of during the whole of the debate. It might suit two men quarrelling on the street, but he thought it was not a line of argument suited for this House, for hon. gentlemen to defend their own tergiversations by charging their opponents with having been guilty of similar conduct. (Hear, hear.) Yet every member on the side of the Government, from the

Provincial Secretary, who spoke for four or five hours, to the Postmaster General, had freely indulged in personalities, scraping together from past records, as the Premier would say, every scrap of paper that they thought would suit their purpose. Even were those counter-charges true, what answer were they to the country for the tergiversations of the government. (Hear, hear.) But he denied the answers to the charges which the hon. member for Lambton had brought against the Administration, they were not at all applicable. (Hear, hear.) The Postmaster General, as one answer to the member for Lambton's speech, had spoken of the influence of that hon. gentleman's paper. According to the Postmaster General's statement, the hon. member had almost been the greatest man of any civilized country; he had made Governments, turned out Governments, put up this man, turned out that man, and had things all his own way for the last 10 or 15 years. (Hear, hear.) Yet, notwithstanding all that, hon. gentlemen opposite professed to despise his influence and his power. (Hear, hear.) They appeared, however, to apprehend some fearful results from the influence of the hon. gentleman and his paper, or they would not make such constant attacks upon him, as if the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton had made them forget their propriety altogether. (Hear, hear.) In reference to the principal charge brought against his hon. friend, that he had assisted in turning out the late administration, he would ask the Postmaster General if he was very much disappointed and dissatisfied that he did so? (Hear, hear.) Had the hon. member for Lambton by so doing made an uncomfortable berth for him? (Hear, hear and laughter.) And, as regarded the question of morality, for that was the ground that the Postmaster-General put it upon, if the hon. member for Lambton could be accused of having done something politically very immoral, in turning out the Reform Administration, and advocating the election of the hon. gentlemen who sat beside the Postmaster General, could the Postmaster General complain much of that when he took his seat comfortably beside those hon. gentlemen, and undertook to carry on the Government with them? (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Postmaster General surely could not complain when he had made more out of the alleged act of inconsistency on the part of the member for Lambton, than that hon. member had made out of it himself. (Hear, hear.) But the country would very well understand that that was not the position in which the question should be placed. The people understood very well, and hon. gentlemen opposite would admit it, if they were as candid as they ought to be, that, for instance, as regarded the speech of which portions had been read by the hon. member who last spoke, there was no great inconsistency between anything that was in that speech and the course which the hon. member for Lambton took a short time afterwards. The people understood very well, and none better than most of the members of the present Government, that a very good reason existed for a crusade being made against the late Administration by any newspaper or any political man in the country--that there were reports circulated as to the integrity of their actions and the purity of their hands, as regarded the manner in which they discharged their duties, which, if true, called for the reprobation of the country. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Freeman,) did not say that those reports were true, but it was quite enough that the country had heard them, and strongly suspected that there was a good deal of truth in them now. (Hear, hear.) He would ask them whether those reports came to such a stage as to be generally believed, and a strong suspicion was entertained almost everywhere that they were true, he would ask whether the displacement of an Administration guilty of such acts as were charged against them was not a matter of far more immediate importance than the settlement of the Clergy Reserve question on a particular day. (Hear, hear.) He held that this House, if it felt as it ought to do, as to the importance of the purity and cleanness of the hands in which the ... political destinies of the country were placed, they would say that the first duty was to purge the Administration of the day, before any healthy legislation on any question could

properly be had. (Hear, hear.) The country perfectly understood that a question which had been agitated for 20 or 30 years could very well stand over, till that other and more pressing work was accomplished. It was thought necessary by the Opposition, comprising most of the members of the present Government, to perform that work, and he believed that his hon. friend from Lambton felt that he was doing a public service when he spread before the country the charges against that Administration. (Hear, hear.) And, now that the evidence had been taken in reference to those charges, he must say that his opinion now was that they had not been made a[ll]together without foundation. (Hear, hear.) Throughout this debate the hon. member for Lambton had been made the butt of attack by every member who had spoken on the Ministerial side. Now, he had no hesitation in saying that so far as that hon. gentleman's political opinions were generally known, they were shared in fully as generally, if not more generally by the country than the opinions of any other member of this House. (Loud cries of ... Hear, hear.) He ventured to say that except in reference to the Elective Legislative Council measure, there was scarcely any one subject advocated by that hon. member which was not concurred in by every professed Reformer who supported the administration. And as to that one question of the Elective Council, he would ask the House, if that hon. gentleman had ever expressed but one opinion on that subject. (Hear, hear.) From the earliest knowledge that he ever had of that hon. gentleman--from the first expressions he had ever heard him give on that question--his opinion had been as it was now; he felt that it would be dangerous to our present system, and the destruction of responsible government, if the Upper House was made elective. And there were others in this House who entertained the same view. (Hear, hear.) Why, then, should the hon. member for Lambton be made the butt of so much attack, seeing that he had been consistent on all the measures which he advocated? He believed it could only be accounted for on the principle he had already mentioned--that it was from that seat that the Ministry had the greatest apprehension, and on that account they levelled all their force against that hon. member. (Hear, hear.) He had no hesitation in saying, further, that that hon. member exercised more influence in the country than any other member of the House. His voice was heard by more of the people of the country than the voice of any other member, and as much attention was paid to his views as to those of any member of the House.<sup>341</sup>

MR. POWELL.--I am sorry for it.<sup>342</sup>

MR. FREEMAN was not surprised that the member for Carleton should be sorry for it, because the most of the principles advocated by the member for Lambton were opposed by the member for Carleton, and he supposed he would not like to see the triumph of any principle in which he did not share. Yet if he lived much longer and retained his present views, the member for Carleton would find many measures which he regretted to see, passed, and the country flourishing and prosperous, notwithstanding. (Hear, hear.) The hon. Commissioner for Crown Lands had made reference to the remark of the hon. member for Lambton that it was a very strange coincidence when people's sentiments changed at the time when they found it profitable to change them. The remark was made with reference to the hon. gentlemen who first formed the present Administration, but it was equally applicable to some of those who took office in it afterwards.--(Hear, hear.) The hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had excused the change in his views on the subject of the Legislative Council by saying that after he had stood out and argued the question year after year, he felt that he might afford to change. He (Mr. Freeman) would just have reasoned the other way. That hon. gentleman had occupied a seat in the House year after year, Parliament after Parliament, had seen the question discussed in the public papers, had

conducted a public paper himself, in which he discussed it, had used every possible argument against it, and it was certainly a very remarkable coincidence that he changed his opinion, just when it was convenient for him to get into office, and took charge of the bill to give effect to the principle which he had during the whole of his previous life opposed. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. gentleman's conduct in that respect was quite consistent with similar courses that had been taken by his colleagues. (Hear, hear.)<sup>343</sup>

MR. LARWILL addressed the House at some length in a jocular manner, which elicited repeated peals of laughter. He expressed his determination to support the ministry.<sup>344</sup> Il parla de la manière dont se faisaient les élections, et des usages auxquels les candidats étaient obligés de se soumettre, en visitant leurs électeurs, entre autres celui d'embrasser des enfants laids et malpropres, et d'être obligés de faire des compliments flatteurs aux parens. Il dit qu'il ne connaissait que l'hon. J.H. Cameron qui n'avait jamais voulu se soumettre à cela parce qu'il était trop aristocrate, de même que M. Brown n'avait jamais pu se décider à aller à cheval, dans les courses qu'il avait faites dans son comté.<sup>345</sup> [He] showed how very consistently the Opposition had acted. Satirically pointed out how Mr. Dorion, lamenting over the great indebtedness the Province had--copying the hon. member for Haldimand--turned pounds into dollars; and made the amount into twenty millions! and from that fact arguing that the Province was on the very verge of bankruptcy. But, lo! the member for Montreal contradicts him, and points out the great progress of the trade of the Province--tells us how he proposes to remove the rocks and other obstructions of the St. Lawrence--that he was going to construct a canal to Lake Champlain, and we were going to have one from the Ottawa to Lake Huron, which would transmute everything into gold--and flour, and all other produce would be supplied to the favoured western cities at less than nothing. The very efficient manner in which the city of Toronto was represented, next engaged Mr. Larwill's attention ... [to] Mr. Brown, Mr. Bowes, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Cayley, Mr. Angus Morrison, Mr. Gamble, and he expressed a hope that when representation by population came into operation, that it would be provided that members should reside in the city, or the county they represented at the time. As to the seat of the government, the inhabitants of Toronto were well represented.<sup>346</sup>

Some member here ... [called] upon the Speaker to give them a few good hi[n]ts to wind up the debate.<sup>347</sup>

MR. LARWILL said that he thought he could not do better than point out the great expense these long speeches had already cost the country. As he was of opinion that his own speech had already cost them more than it was worth, he should conclude by sitting down.<sup>348</sup>

DR. SOUTHWICK rose among loud cries of question.<sup>349</sup> [He] justified his support of the Ministry in a speech (which was almost inaudible in the gallery) by a reference to the opinions expressed in his own constituency.<sup>350</sup> [He] defended himself as a reformer, for his conduct in supporting the present ministry; and contended that the people generally approved of the conduct of the ministry, and even of that Commutation clause, to which many were opposed. He approved of separate schools, and had told his electors so when he was chosen.<sup>351</sup> He expressed himself as ready at once to accept the various measures propounded in the speech with the exception of the Police Bill, which he should carefully consider when it was laid before the House.<sup>352</sup>

The question was then taken on Mr. Brown's amendment to the Address<sup>353</sup>.

(46)

*And the Question being put; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--*

YEAS.

*Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Fergusson, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Holton, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, Wright, and Young.--(33.)*

NAYS.

*Messieurs Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Cryslar, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Évanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Jackson, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Niles, O'Farrell, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Roblin, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(73.)*

*So it passed in the Negative.*<sup>354</sup>

On the announcement of the division, there was some cheering from the ministerial benches.<sup>355</sup>

MR. MURNEY rose to move the adjournment of the debate, and in doing so, wished those who had applauded to understand that because members were forced to vote with them, they must not think that they had the confidence of the country.<sup>356</sup> He felt humiliated at the course the debate had taken, when he heard it said that all his old friends had turned Radicals, and that they were only worthy of support on that account.<sup>357</sup>

[Mr. Murney's motion for] adjournment ... was postponed, however, in order to pass the 3rd paragraph of the address, which was done on the same division as that above.<sup>358</sup>

(46)

*The Question being then put on the third paragraph; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--*

(46-47)

YEAS.

*Messieurs Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Cryslar, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Évanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Jackson, Laporte, Larwill, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Niles, O'Farrell, Patrick,*

Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Roblin, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(73.)

(47)

NAYS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Fergusson, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Holton, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, Wright, and Young.--(33.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative. 359

The fourth paragraph being again read,

And a Debate arising thereupon;

On motion of Mr. Murney, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie,

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned until to-morrow. 360

Then, on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Smith, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond,

The House adjourned. 361

APPENDIX: 25 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: PROPERTY CHARGED WITH SUBSTITUTION.]

MR. LORANGER [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill, intituled, "An Act to permit the alienation of a certain part of properties charged with substitution."<sup>362</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: RECORDER'S COURT IN QUEBEC.]

MR. ALLEYN [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to establish a Recorders' Court in the City of Quebec.<sup>363</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: SHIPPING.]

MR. ALLEYN [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to encourage Shipbuilding in this Province.<sup>364</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: OBSERVANCE OF LORD'S DAY.]

MR. BROWN [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to relieve the employes in certain public Departments from Sunday labour.<sup>365</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: RAILWAY CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACT.]

MR. VALOIS [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act.<sup>366</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: MAYOR OF QUEBEC.]

MR. ALLEYN [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to render the Mayor of Quebec elective by the Electors of the City of Quebec.<sup>367</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: LAW OF PARTNERSHIP.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Monday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Law of Partnership.<sup>368</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: LAW OF LIMITED LIABILITY.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Monday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Law relating to limited liability.<sup>369</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: COMMON SCHOOL FUND.]

MR. MERRITT [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, representing that--the first and second clauses of the 12 Victoria, cap. 200, intituled, "An Act to raise an income of one hundred thousand pounds, out of the public lands of Canada, for Common School Education," enact that all monies that shall arise from the sale of any of the public lands of

the Province, shall be set apart for the purpose of creating Capital, which shall be sufficient to produce a clear income of one hundred thousand pounds per annum, to form a Public School Fund; and that the said Fund shall not be alienated for any other purpose whatever; but shall be and remain a perpetual Fund for the support of Common Schools, and the establishment of Township and Parish Libraries; and praying that His Excellency will be pleased to direct the proper officer to lay before this house, as soon as practicable, a Return of the gross amount received annually from the sales of any of the public lands since the passage of said Act, in Upper and Lower Canada; also, representing to His Excellency, that, by the third clause of the said Act, one million acres of land, as a special appropriation, the proceeds of which, after paying for the management or sale thereof, with the amount of Indian Annuities thereon, shall be applied towards creating the said Common School Fund; and praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this house, a return of the gross amount received from the sale of those lands, the cost of management, and the amount of the Indian annuities charged against the said one million of acres; also a statement shewing the number of acres sold, giving the average price per acre, the number of acres unsold, and the average price at which the land is now held, in order that [the] house may be placed in possession of all necessary information as to the amount to which the Common School Fund is entitled under the said recited Act.<sup>370</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: MUNICIPAL LOAN FUNDS OF UPPER AND LOWER CANADA.]

MR. BROWN [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying him to cause to be laid before this house a return of all applications by Municipalities for loans from the Municipal Loan Funds of Upper and Lower Canada respectively, and the amounts thereof; also, shewing the Municipalities that have received loans from the said Funds, and the amounts and objects of such loans, and setting forth what portions of the said loans have been refunded, and such portions as are past due but still unpaid.<sup>371</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SEIGNIORIAL TENURE.]

MR. JOBIN [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before the House, a Return of all Sales of Seigniories subject to the payment of Quint on the mutation thereof, showing the amount of Quint paid, and, if not paid, why such payment has not been enforced?<sup>372</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: TOWAGE IN GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE.]

MR. YOUNG [gave notice that he would move an] Address to His Excellency, praying him to cause to be laid before this house a return of the vessels towed in each season by the Tug Boat Contractors below Quebec, since the commencement of their contract, with a statement of the name and tonnage of each ship, and the distance which the Tug Boats moved each vessel.<sup>373</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.]

MR. BROWN [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il] proposera une résolution en faveur de la représentation basée sur la population.<sup>374</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: COMMON SCHOOL ACT OF UPPER CANADA.]

MR. BROWN [donne avis que] lundi, le 10 mars [il] proposera une résolution à propos des dispositions sectaires des actes des écoles élémentaires du Haut-Canada.<sup>375</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: RECTORIES OF UPPER CANADA.]

MR. BROWN [gave notice that] on Wednesday, 12th March [he would move] a Resolution in regard to the Rectories of Upper Canada.<sup>376</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: EDUCATION IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. A. DORION [donne avis que] jeudi prochain [il fera motion pour] que cette chambre se forme en comité général pour prendre en considération les résolutions suivantes:

1. Que malgré les progrès de l'éducation dans le Bas-Canada, durant ces dernières années, l'expérience a démontré que les lois actuelles pour pourvoir à l'instruction élémentaire dans le Bas-Canada sont insuffisantes pour mettre l'instruction publique en rapport avec les besoins de la population de cette partie de la province, et pour assurer un bon système d'enseignement élémentaire.

2. Qu'aucun système d'éducation ne peut fonctionner dans le Bas-Canada d'une manière avantageuse, sans une direction énergique et intelligente au moyen d'un conseil général d'instruction publique, aidé de conseils spéciaux dans chacun des districts de la province, et sans une surveillance active et éclairée au moyen d'inspecteurs employés dans chaque district judiciaire du Bas-Canada.

3. Que l'absence d'instituteurs qualifiés est l'une des principales causes du peu de progrès dans le Bas-Canada, et que pour remédier au besoin qui s'en fait sentir, il devrait être immédiatement pourvu à l'établissement d'une école normale.

4. Que la fondation de bibliothèques publiques devrait être encouragée comme étant l'un des moyens de répandre le goût de l'éducation dans toutes les classes de la société, et que des allocations annuelles devraient être faites à cette fin.

5. Que l'octroi annuel pour le soutien des écoles élémentaires est insuffisant et qu'il devrait être porté à la somme de \$                      courant.<sup>377</sup>

## [NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: SETTLEMENT OF VACANT LANDS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES.]

MR. BUREAU [gave notice that] on Friday next [he would move for a] Committee of the Whole to take into consideration the following Resolutions:--

That Agriculture is one of the chief elements of prosperity and wealth in Canada.

That in order to develop its resources, it is important to encourage the settlement of the wild lands belonging to the domains of the Crown.

That gratuitous grants of land ought to be made to the denizens of the soil of Canada to facilitate the settlement thereof, and prevent immigration, and by these means to encourage agriculture and foster commerce and manufactures.

That for this purpose it is expedient to make choice in Upper and Lower Canada of a tract of land of sufficient extent, suitable for cultivation and accessible by good roads.

That the Municipal Loan Fund Act, 16 Vict., cap. 22, ought to be so amended as to enable the Municipalities of Lower Canada to effect Loans to encourage the

settlers on lands in Lower Canada and assist them in the clearing (sic) of lands so granted to them for the purpose of settling the Country.<sup>378</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: BANKRUPT LAW.]

MR. BROWN [gave notice that] on Monday next [he would move] a Resolution on the subject of the Provincial Bankrupt Law.<sup>379</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE RE: PETITION OF JOSEPH S. LEE.]

MR. RANKIN [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would move for a] Select Committee of five members to consider and report upon the petition of Joseph S. Lee, of Ottawa, the said Committee to consist of the Hon. W.B. Robinson, and Messrs. Yeilding, Loranger, Powell, and the mover.<sup>380</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION RE: PRINTING OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.]

MR. THIBAUDEAU [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il] proposera qu'ordre soit donné à qui de droit d'imprimer un nombre suffisant de votes et procédés de cette chambre, pour que chaque membre puisse en avoir trente copies.<sup>381</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION RE: STANDING COMMITTEE ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.]

MR. CAMERON [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move] to reduce the Quorum of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, to five Members.<sup>382</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: PAYMENT OF GRAND JURORS IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. BOURASSA [donne avis que] mercredi prochain [il] demandera au ministère si c'est l'intention du gouvernement d'introduire, durant la présente session, une mesure pour pourvoir au paiement des grands jurés dans le Bas-Canada.<sup>383</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: COLLECTION OF TIMBER DUTIES.]

MR. MCCANN [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether it is their intention to make any change in the present mode of collecting duties on Timber and Saw Logs out on Public Lands in the United Counties of Prescott and Russell; Lumberers on both sides of the Ottawa River being put to great inconveni[e]nce and hardship by being compelled to go to Montreal, where the Agent resides, a distance of a hundred or more miles, to pay timber duties and clearances for timber cut on private lands?<sup>384</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND ASYLUM.]

MR. AIKINS [gave notice that] on Thursday next [he would make an] Enquiry of Ministry, whether it is their intention during the present Session to make any further appropriation for the erection of an Asylum or Asylums for the deaf and dumb, or to expend the appropriations already made for that purpose?<sup>385</sup>

[CORRECTION TO THE ORDER OF THE DAY RE: SALARY OF CHIEF JUDGE EDWARD BOWEN.]

MR. LORANGER drew the attention of the speaker to the incorrect mention made in the order of the day, of certain resolutions which he (Mr. L.) intended to introduce relative to Chief Justice Bowen's claim to be paid an additional sum of 200L beyond the sum of 1000L which he has received for a few years past as salary; those resolutions having reference only to those past years, and not to increase of the salary for the future as incorrectly inserted in the order of the day.<sup>386</sup>

Upon which MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ordered a rectification.<sup>387</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 25 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, reports Mr. Laporte introduced this petition.
2. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
3. In a commentary, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856, remarks that "the debate upon the address in reply to the speech from the throne, drags its slow length along to-day." LE PAYS, 4 March 1856, also reports a short comment: "La discussion sur l'adresse a recommencé aujourd'hui avec plus de vigueur que jamais."
4. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. Several newspapers report short commentaries on this speech. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856, reports Mr. Spence "rose to speak as soon as the orders of the day were called, and has made a long, earnest and effective speech, principally in reply to Mr. Brown". GLOBE, 26 February 1856, deprecates Mr. Spence's speech in the following comment: "Mr. Postmaster General Spence opened the discussion shortly after three o'clock, with one of the most remarkable torrents of vituperation ever heard in a deliberative Assembly--all directed, we need hardly say, at the member for Lambton. He raked up all the old tales of alleged inconsistency and venality ... which have been repeated and repeated over and over again, usque adnauseam. Mr. Spence did not pretend to justify the measures of the Government; like his colleagues, Messrs. Cayley and McDonald, he found it much easier to throw mud at his opponents, than to defend his own conduct as a minister of the Crown." LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, also writes: "Le maître de poste général Spence ouvre la discussion par un long discours dans lequel il foudroie les membres de l'opposition et surtout celui qui naguères encore était le chef de ce parti. Inconséquences et vénalité, tels sont les deux mots dont il flétrit la plupart des membres de la gauche."
5. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
6. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
7. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
8. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
9. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
10. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
11. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
12. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
14. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
15. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, reports very similar information; however, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856, reports a different version of these facts, as follows: "The popular wish had sometimes been only to get the land sold, and at others to get the property equitably divided, and at others to abolish the endowment of all churches whatever."
16. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
18. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
19. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
20. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
21. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
22. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
24. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
25. IBID.
26. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.

27. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
28. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
29. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
30. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
31. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
32. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
33. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
34. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
35. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
36. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
37. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
38. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
39. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
40. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
41. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
42. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
43. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
44. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
45. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
46. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
47. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
48. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
49. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
50. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
51. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
52. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
53. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
54. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
55. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
56. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
57. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
58. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
59. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856. The ellipsis represents illegible words.
60. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
61. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
62. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
63. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
64. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
65. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
66. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
67. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
68. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
69. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
70. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. In its synopsis of debate, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, also reports that Mr. Spence referred to Dr. Ryerson's report of 1852.
71. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, specifies the provision here referred to is "the 19th clause of the School Act", by which separate schools are allowed to be established.
72. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
73. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
74. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.

75. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
76. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856. According to GLOBE, 26 February 1856, Mr. Spence affirmed that "indeed the Government deserved great credit for ... what they had done in the matter."
78. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
79. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856.
80. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
81. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
82. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
83. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
84. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
85. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
86. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
87. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
88. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, concurs with this information.
89. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
90. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
91. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
92. IBID.
93. IBID.
94. IBID.
95. IBID.
96. IBID.
97. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
98. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
99. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
100. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. The three major accounts used in reconstructing this speech differ slightly from one another in the interpretation of this statement. According to MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856, Mr. Holton stated that "the key stone of the whole edifice of the Ministry, was the desertion by a large part of the body of the principles they had maintained all their lives." However, according to TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, Mr. Holton made a direct attack on Mr. MacNab as he is reported to have said "that the present position and future prospects of the Administration was founded on the surrender, by the leader of the present Government, of those principles which he had formerly upheld."
101. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
102. IBID.
103. IBID.
104. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
105. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
106. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
107. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
108. IBID.
109. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
110. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
111. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
112. IBID.
113. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
114. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
115. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.

116. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
117. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
118. IBID.
119. IBID.
120. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
121. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
122. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
123. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
124. IBID.
125. IBID.
126. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
127. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
128. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
129. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
130. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
131. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
132. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
133. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856, provides the following summary of Mr. Holton's statement: "Il prouva que l'opposition démocratique du Bas-Canada ne s'était séparée de ceux qui avaient été autrefois ses chefs, que parce que ces derniers avaient depuis plusieurs sessions montré leurs sympathies et leurs tendances vers les tories, vers l'ancien family compact, avec qui ils étaient unis maintenant; que cette opposition était aujourd'hui le seul parti qui représentait le grand et glorieux parti qui avait autrefois combattu avec tant de patriotisme pour les droits et les libertés du Bas-Canada, sous la direction de l'hon. L.J. Papineau et des autres hommes illustres de ce tems-là;--que cette opposition était le seul parti avec lequel les vrais libéraux du Haut-Canada pouvaient sympathiser. Il fit voir que les libéraux du Haut-Canada ne supportaient le gouvernement actuel qu'au sacrifice de leurs principes." According to TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, "Mr. Holton attempted to show that the only true allies of the Liberal party of Upper Canada were the Anglo-French Rouges of the Lower Province, and appealed to the Ministerial Liberal supporters to see whether there were any great public questions on which they were not united with Lower Canada Opposition Liberals--provided they were true to their principles."
134. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
135. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
136. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
137. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
138. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
139. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
140. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
141. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
142. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
143. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
144. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856, reports Mr. Holton also named Mr. Cartier.
145. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
146. IBID.
147. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
148. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
149. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
150. IBID.

151. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
152. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
153. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
154. IBID.
155. IBID.
156. IBID.
157. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
158. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
159. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, reports Mr. Powell "discussed the character of writers who had called in question the political integrity of the gentleman whom he recognizes as his political leader".
160. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
161. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
162. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
163. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
164. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
165. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
166. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
167. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
168. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
169. IBID.
170. IBID.
171. IBID.
172. IBID.
173. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
174. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
175. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
176. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
177. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
178. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
179. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
180. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
181. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
182. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
183. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
184. IBID.
185. IBID.
186. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
187. IBID.
188. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
189. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
190. IBID.
191. IBID.
192. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
193. IBID.
194. IBID.
195. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
196. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
197. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
198. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
199. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
200. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.

201. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
202. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
203. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
204. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
205. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
206. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
207. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
208. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
209. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
210. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
211. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
212. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
213. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
214. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
215. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
216. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
217. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
218. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
219. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856, adds that Mr. Cauchon "s'était décidé à abandonner son opposition au conseil législatif électif trois mois avant d'être fait ministre."
220. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
221. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856. In its synopsis of debate, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, reports Mr. Cauchon referred to Lord Durham's Report to support his assertions.
222. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
223. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856.
224. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
225. LA MINERVE, 5 March 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, provides a short commentary praising Mr. Cauchon's oratory style.
226. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
227. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
228. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
229. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
230. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
231. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
232. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
233. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856. In its synopsis of debate, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, reports Mr. Gamble also "lectured Mr. Brown for having described Mr. Cameron's assumed independence as much more contemptible than that of an out-and-out supporter of the Government".
234. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
235. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
236. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
237. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
238. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
239. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
240. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
241. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
242. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
243. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
244. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
245. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.

246. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
247. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
248. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
249. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
250. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
251. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
252. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
253. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856, provides the following version of Mr. Gamble's statement: "He might be republican in his sentiments, but he was far from being a democrat; he hated them as he hated he would not say what."
254. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
255. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
256. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
257. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
258. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
259. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
260. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
261. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
262. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
263. MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856.
264. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
265. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
266. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
267. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
268. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
269. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
270. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
271. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
272. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
273. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
274. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
275. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
276. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
277. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
278. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
279. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
280. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
281. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
282. IBID.
283. IBID.
284. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
285. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, provides similar information; however, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856, reports the following numbers: "There were 130 members of the House, each equally entitled to express their opinions with him. Had they all occupied the same time, they would have consumed 650 hours for 104 days, at a cost to the country of 80 or 90,000L, just to deliver their opinions on the speech from the throne." MORNING CHRONICLE, 1 March 1856, concurs with the Montreal Gazette, except for the last costs numbering them at "70L or 60,000L".
286. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
287. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
288. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.

289. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
290. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
291. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
292. IBID.
293. IBID.
294. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. In a short commentary, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, deprecates Mr. Dufresne's position on the question of the Clergy Reserves.
295. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, comments that "Mr. Pouliot spoke at length in a mixture of French and English, gesticulating vigorously at the expense of Mr. Brown, and the Opposition generally." GLOBE, 26 February 1856, also reports the following short comment: "Dr. Pouliot['s] ... name ought to be polyglot, judging from the mixture of languages in which he addressed the House." LE PAYS, 4 March 1856, reports a similar commentary.
296. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
297. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
298. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856, differs from this account and reports Mr. Pouliot "... [glanced] at the divisions of the opposition, and ... [called] their camp a new Babel".
299. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
300. IBID.
301. IBID.
302. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
303. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856. The reader will find a word-for-word translation of this report in GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
304. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
305. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
306. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856. This report is a word-for-word translation of an account found in MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February.
307. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
308. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
309. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
310. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
311. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
312. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
313. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
314. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
315. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
316. IBID.
317. IBID.
318. IBID.
319. IBID.
320. IBID.
321. IBID.
322. IBID.
323. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
324. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
325. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
326. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
327. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, reports the following comment: "Mr. Papin ... delighted even those who did not understand him, by his fine elocution and graceful gestures."

328. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
329. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
330. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
331. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
332. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
333. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
334. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
335. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. According to MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856, Mr. Morrison himself affirmed that Mr. Brown "was then an avowed tool of the Baldwin Ministry."
336. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. The exact text of the report reads as follows: "[Mr. A. Morrison] was disconcerted by Mr. Mackenzie saying he couldn't remember."
337. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
338. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
339. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. In a commentary, GLOBE, 26 February 1856, describes Mr. Morrison's speech in the following manner: "Mr. Angus Morrison attacked the member for Lambton, and was well laughed at by the House for his trouble. He said 'Lo and behold' no less than five times, and pronounced Premier, prime-ear!... He said he admired the Globe in its commercial aspect, and for its intelligence, but, 'Oh!' said he, 'the editorials I condemn.' He declared his intention to support the Government--a decision which will astonish nobody, and will interest few, except his unfortunate constituents in North Simcoe."
340. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
341. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. The first two sets of ellipses represent illegible words.
342. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
343. GLOBE, 26 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, differs from this account and reports Mr. Freeman concluded his speech "with an attack upon the hon. PostMaster General which the hon. gentleman promptly repelled."
344. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. Other newspapers report similar information. For example, GLOBE, 26 February 1856, remarks that Mr. Larwill "made an amusing speech, amidst the laughter of the members". TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856, resumes the speech by reporting that "Mr. Larwill made a variety of facetious observations as to the meagerness of the speech and weakness of the Opposition speeches." GLOBE, 26 February 1856, also provides the following commentary: "Mr. Larwill kept the house in laughter for some time with his quizzical remarks. It was very funny, and amused the ladies in the gallery immensely, but it did strike us that it was a little undignified in the Legislature to sit listening to his jokes. Could not the honourable member for Kent be persuaded to go through his speech in the tabacie (sic), or perhaps Mr. Nickinson could spare the Lyceum for an hour."
345. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856.
346. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
347. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
348. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
349. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
350. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, specifies Dr. Southwick "was almost entirely inaudible in the galleries on account of his position under them." TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, reports the following information: "Dr. Southwick made some observations in support

of the Government, and defining the reasons which had influenced him in so doing, but they were so inaudible in the Reporters' Gallery that their tenor could not be fully gathered".

351. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. This account never mentions Dr. Southwick was almost inaudible, and reports more detailed information.
352. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 26 February 1856.
353. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
354. Newspaper accounts providing coverage of this division greatly differ from the JOURNALS in their report of the vote: omitting Dr. Clarke's name, they all report 72 members voted nay. Furthermore, the JOURNALS and Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856), report Dr. Poulin voted with the Nays, while GLOBE, 26 February 1856, HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, and LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, instead report Mr. Polette's name. A commentary from HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, specifies Dr. Poulin was then absent from the House.

Very many newspapers provide commentaries and vote analyses relative to Mr. Brown's amendment. GLOBE, 26 February 1856, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, GLOBE, 1 March 1856, and LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, all focus their commentary on the Upper Canadian Reformers who voted against the amendment. GLOBE, 1 March 1856, states that Mr. Brown's amendment "brought out the position of every Upper Canadian in strong light.... To vote for that clause, and against the amendment offered by the Opposition, was to endorse all that the Ministry had done in the matter of the Reserves.... Yet among those who voted thus were men who represent purely voluntary constituencies--men pledged deeply to resist every attempt of the Church party to continue that system of favoritism which has so long troubled the Province. Such men as Bell, Church, Cook of Oxford, Jackson, Matheson, Niles, Roblin, Ross, the two Smiths, and Southwick--all represent Radical counties, and have always been opposed to State Churchism, till lately. What can excuse them for endorsing the policy of the Government on the Reserve question? It is almost useless to ask a question which the people have already answered. Not one of these men can be returned again to Parliament. The public voice has already pronounced them recreant to their pledges, and worthy of the deepest condemnation."

HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, provides a detailed analysis of the tendencies reflected by this vote, which also gives valuable information concerning the members absent from the House: "Five regular Oppositionists were absent from the division, namely: Cooke, of Ottawa, Hartman, Marchildon, Merritt, and Rolph.... The members on the Ministerial side absent from the division, were: Sir A.N. Macnab, Hon. W.B. Robinson, Poulin and Lumsden.... The whole number of absentees who have not yet taken their seats is 13, namely: Messrs. Blanchet, Clarke, Delong, Dewitt, Egan, Huot, Labelle, Mongenais, Ross (Sol. General), Sanborn, Tache, and Terrill."

Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856), divides the vote in this manner: "Upper Canada yeas 19, nays 36--majority 17. Lower Canadian yeas 14, nays 36--majority 22.... Total, 39 [of majority]." A similar information is reported in HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, but this Telegraph report is mathematically more sound.

355. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
356. IBID.
357. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
358. GLOBE, 26 February 1856.
359. Newspaper accounts again differ from the JOURNALS in their report of the vote. Once more omitting Dr. Clarke's name, they report 72 members voted yea.

Furthermore, GLOBE, 26 February 1856, HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 27 February 1856, and LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, report that Mr. Polette voted with the Yeas, while the JOURNALS and Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856), instead report Dr. Poulin's name.

360. In a commentary, GLOBE, 26 February 1856, reports the following information: "The debate and the House were again adjourned by the Government, the Opposition expressing no desire for any further debate." However, amendments to some of the remaining paragraphs of the Address will be proposed by members of the Opposition on the 26th February 1856, with continuing debates.

361. According to GLOBE, 26 February 1856, and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, the House adjourned at half-past twelve.

LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, reports this final commentary on today's debate: "Le tournoi parlementaire du 25 février comptera dans la mémoire des uns et des autres. Chez les membres de l'opposition, le souvenir en sera pénible, car leur parti a reçu pendant la joute le coup de grâce, tandis que les défenseurs de l'administration se rappelleront avec fierté l'intrépidité qu'ils ont déployée dans la lutte et le succès glorieux de leur ban[n]ière politique."

Several newspapers provide commentaries on the much discussed question of the division within the Opposition, and within the Ministry. Amongst others, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856, reports a long commentary in reaction to some of the ideas expressed by Mr. Holton in the course of his speech today. Its main view is, that it is "not ... possible to get a Ministry together, who can act together with more perfect unanimity than that which now sits upon the Treasury benches; nor could supporters be found for any other Government among whom there would be closer political affinities. What a direful waste of time, then, is all this prating about inconsistencies and corruptions &c. &c. &c., tending to no conceivable practical result? It just leads to a process of crimination and recrimination, breeding a vast deal of ill nature, and very little useful Legislation." In its commentary, HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856, also states: "The Opposition are divided amongst themselves, and so split up on nearly all the leading questions of the day that they cannot even hope to do more than retard the legislation required by the country."

GLOBE, 26 February 1856, also reports a long commentary which defends the very opposite point of view, summarized in the following excerpt: "The present Opposition is stronger than either of those that we have mentioned and more united, while the ministry which it resists is weaker and more divided.... The Government hirelings may sneer at them [the Opposition] because they have not a majority of the House, but as a minority they exercise more power over the legislation of the country than the cabinet's majority. They are backed by public opinion, against which the Government is powerless while it remains in Upper Canada."

362. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.

363. IBID.

364. IBID.

365. IBID.

366. IBID.

367. IBID.

368. IBID.

369. IBID.

370. IBID.

371. IBID.

372. IBID.

373. IBID.

- 374. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856.
- 375. IBID.
- 376. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
- 377. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856.
- 378. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
- 379. IBID.
- 380. IBID.
- 381. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856.
- 382. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
- 383. LE PAYS, 4 March 1856.
- 384. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
- 385. IBID.
- 386. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 27 February 1856.
- 387. IBID.

TUESDAY, 26 FEBRUARY 1856.

(47)

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House, That he had, in conformity with the Statute in that case made and provided, issued his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery this day, to make out a new Writ of Election for the County of Renfrew.

Mr. Speaker laid before the House, Report from L'Hospice St. Joseph de la Maternité de Québec, for the year ending 31st December, 1855.

For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 4.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Thomas Fortier,--The Petition of the Seminary of Nicolet; and the Peti-

(48)

tion of the Reverend John Harper, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St. Grégoire, County of Nicolet.

By Mr. Shaw,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Village of Smith's Falls.<sup>1</sup>

By Mr. Cooke,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Eardley, County of Ottawa; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Buckingham, County of Ottawa; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Masham, County of Ottawa; the Petition of the Municipality of the Village of Buckingham, County of Ottawa; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Wakefield, County of Ottawa; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Aylmer, County of Ottawa; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Lochaber, County of Ottawa.

By Mr. Conger,--The Petition of Robert D. Rogers and others, of the Scotch Village, in the Township of Otonabee.

By the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald,--The Petition of George Munro, of the City of Toronto, Merchant.

By Mr. McCann,--The Petition of James Dandy and others, of the Township [of] Hawkesbury, County of Prescott.

By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of the Reverend J.R. Paré, Curé of the Parish of St. Jacques, County of Montcalm.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--Two Petitions of the Session of the Free Presbyterian Church of St. Catharines.

By the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond,--The Petition of the St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum of the City of Montreal.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the Town of Brantford.

By Mr. Jackson,--The Petition of Alexander McNabb, Reeve of the Township of Saugeen, and others, of the Township of Bruce; and the Petition of the Ontario Division, No. 26, of the Sons of Temperance.

By Mr. Price,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Chicoutimi; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Tremblay, County of Chicoutimi.

By Mr. Larwill,--The Petition of Ingram Taylor and others, of the County of Kent; and the Petition of Peter C. Blackburn and others, of the Township of Dawn.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Kinloss, County of Bruce; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Huron, County of Bruce.

By Mr. James Smith,--The Petition of Thomas Kay and others, of the Town of Lindsay, County of Victoria; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Ops, County of Victoria.

By Mr. Alleyn,--The Petition of the Quebec Board of Trade; and the Petition of the Quebec Infant School.

By Mr. Powell,--Two Petitions of the Municipality of the Township of North Gower.

By Mr. Holton,--The Petition of the Montreal Savings Bank.

By Mr. Turcotte,--The Petition of Isaac Toussignant and others, proprietors of vessels navigating the St. Lawrence, between Quebec and Montreal.

By Mr. Guévremont,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the Town or Borough of William Henry.

By Mr. Yeilding,--The Petition of Mrs. Margaret Fraser, of the City of Ottawa.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Sidney Smith, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented to

(49)

the House the first Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth:--

Your Committee have examined the Petitions of Ephraim Doolittle and others, of the Township of Haldimand; and of John Wade, of the Township of Hamilton, and of Benjamin Seymour, of the Town of Port Hope, relative to Road Allowances, and find that sufficient notice has been given.

The Petitions of Louis Leclaire and others, of the City of Montreal, for incorporation of the Union St. Joseph de Montréal, and of Ogle R. Gowan, of the City of Toronto, Grand Master of the Orange Association, and others, for an Act of Incorporation, are not, in the opinion of your Committee, of a nature to require the publication of Notice.

Your Committee would respectfully represent that the number of Members of which the Committee is composed renders it difficult for them to obtain a Quorum for the transaction of business, and they beg leave to recommend, that the Quorum be reduced to six.

Ordered, That the Quorum of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, for the transaction of business, be reduced from eight to six Members.

Ordered, That the Petition of Joseph Smith Lee, of the City of Ottawa, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Smith, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond,

Ordered, That the Orders of the day be now read.

And the Order of the day being read, for resuming the adjourned Debate, upon the fourth paragraph of the Question which was on Wednesday last proposed, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season, in compliance with what His Excellency beli[e]ves to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of

Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises, in like manner, to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress that has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council by rendering it elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime, and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

(50)

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law, and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that, since their last meeting, nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing the Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

(51)

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs' Duties which were made by Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic, we have however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:

That we agree with His Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies:

That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event.

The House resumed the said adjourned Debate.<sup>3</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER having put the question on the fourth paragraph of the resolutions,<sup>4</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST of Beauharnois, ... in French<sup>5</sup>: M. l'Orateur.--Malgré que les débats sur les résolutions en réponse au discours du trône se soient déjà prolongés depuis plusieurs jours et que presque tous les sujets importants de politique et de législation aient été abordés par les orateurs qui m'ont précédé, je crois devoir offrir quelques observations avant de proposer mon amendement à ce paragraphe de l'adresse.

Sans entrer dans la discussion du mérite comparatif des institutions gouvernementales, et sans exposer ici la nature du régime que je voudrais voir prévaloir dans l'administration des affaires publiques, je ne puis m'empêcher de faire allusion à ce qu'a dit l'hon. membre pour le comté de Québec (M. Evanturel) en exposant les raisons qui l'engagent à donner son appui au présent ministère.

L'hon. membre commence par dire qu'il est un homme de parti et qu'il appuie le gouvernement parce qu'il est conservateur. D'autres ont dit qu'ils appuient de même le gouvernement parce qu'il est libéral et réformiste, et l'hon. maître-général des postes, (M. Spence), dans la violente philippique qu'il a dirigée contre l'hon. membre pour Lambton (M. Brown) a déclaré emphatiquement qu'il n'avait renoncé à aucune de ses prédilections réformistes; mais, au contraire, il a reproché amèrement à cet honorable membre d'avoir contribué à briser les liens qui unissaient naguère le grand parti réformiste du Haut-Canada.

Je laisse à ces honorables messieurs le soin de concilier de telles contradictions; mais comme toute consistance (*sic*) politique semble être leur dernière préoccupation, je ne doute pas qu'ils s'entendent à merveille sur le seul principe de cohésion qui les unit: la possession du pouvoir et les douceurs du patronage.

L'hon. membre pour le comté de Québec a été plus loin;<sup>6</sup> [il] nous a dit en présentant ses résolutions en réponse au discours du trône, qu'en théorie il pourrait être républicain, mais qu'en pratique il penche pour un gouvernement constitutionnel où la liberté est tempérée par l'autorité, pour un gouvernement rappelant celui de la famille. L'hon. membre voudrait-il nous définir ce qu'il entend par un gouvernement de famille?<sup>7</sup> Trouve-t-il l'idéal de son gouvernement de prédilection dans les institutions politiques de la Russie et des autres Etats despotiques ou monarchiques de l'Europe? Veut-il faire reflourir l'âge patriarcal, moins peut-être la polygamie, mais à coup sûr avec l'esclavage de la famille?<sup>8</sup> Quand on professe et quand on exprime de semblables idées, le gouvernement qui reçoit votre appui cordial me fait peur et me fait trembler pour nos libertés. L'hon. membre a dit que les institutions républicaines ne conviennent pas à un jeune peuple, mais que ce jeune peuple doit grandir sous la tutelle d'un gouvernement de famille. L'hon. membre a oublié que les institutions républicaines ont élevé au premier rang parmi les nations du globe le jeune peuple qui nous avoisine, dès qu'il a pu se soustraire à un gouvernement de famille et briser les liens coloniaux.

Mais ces considérations ne peuvent jamais convaincre l'hon. membre et ceux qui pensent comme lui. Ces hon. MM. ont là un gouvernement de famille; et c'est, sans doute, pour faire ressortir davantage ses dispositions paternelles que ce gouvernement s'entoure d'une armée de volontaires et d'une police armée.

On a cru dire beaucoup en faveur de l'adresse en affirmant qu'elle pêche plutôt par omission que par commission. S'il est vrai qu'une adresse de ce genre ne peut contenir un exposé général de toutes les mesures sur lesquelles le parlement est appelé à législater, d'un autre côté, il est également vrai qu'elle doit faire allusion aux sujets les plus importants qui requièrent l'intervention du gouvernement. Or, que trouvons-nous dans cette adresse? Les ministres, ayant apparemment des

doutes sur le mérite de leurs actes, se montrent plus anxieux d'obtenir de nouveau l'assentiment de la chambre aux mesures de la dernière session que d'indiquer la ligne de conduite qu'ils se proposent de suivre pour ce qui regarde la législation future.

On ne fait aucune allusion aux questions importantes de l'éducation et du commerce, mais on nous demande d'endosser le bill des réserves, le bill de la tenure seigneuriale, la partie la plus odieuse de la loi de milice, et tout ce qui a été fait pour mettre ces lois à exécution. En vérité, c'est par trop exiger de cette chambre, et surtout de l'opposition qui a combattu ces mesures durant la dernière session. Prenez la question de la tenure, par exemple. La loi seigneuriale vous a été imposée par une majorité du Haut-Canada, malgré les instances et les récriminations d'une majorité bas-canadienne. Nous n'avons aucun état, aucune information sur le fonctionnement de cette loi et sur les dépenses qu'elle a entraînées; malgré cela on nous demande d'endosser et la loi et tout ce qu'on a fait pour la mettre à exécution, et d'affirmer que cette chambre "ne doute point qu'elle ne soit satisfaite des progrès qui ont été faits à cet égard."

Est-ce juste? Est-ce raisonnable?

Maintenant pour les omissions. Il n'est pas un seul membre du Bas-Canada qui ne s'attendît à voir, dans l'adresse, un paragraphe concernant l'éducation et la suggestion de quelques réformes à notre système d'écoles communes. Dans quel état sommes-nous aujourd'hui? La première loi des écoles, je veux (*sic*) dire la 7e Vict. chp. 27, pourvoit à ce que les instituteurs subissent certains examens et obtiennent des certificats de qualification avant d'être employés comme tels. L'année 1856 (juillet) y est fixée comme l'époque où les commissaires d'écoles ne pourraient engager aucun instituteurs (*sic*) non qualifié, sous peine d'être privés de l'allocation provinciale. Par une loi passée en 1849, ce délai est raccourci et fixé à l'année 1852. Ainsi, depuis 1852, les commissaires ne pouvaient plus engager d'instituteurs sans diplômes, à moins de s'exposer à perdre l'allocation du gouvernement. Quels sont les faits? Sur 2418 instituteurs et institutrices, il n'y en a que 760 qui soient qualifiés suivant la loi, 691 instituteurs et 69 institutrices.

Si le gouvernement eût mis à exécution la loi de 1851 et nous eût donné des écoles normales, aurions-nous à constater des faits si regrettables? Et ce n'est pas une excuse de crier que la loi de 1851 était insuffisante. Il était du devoir du gouvernement de venir devant cette chambre et de demander une augmentation de l'octroi législatif, s'il était nécessaire; et j'ai droit, et le peuple du Bas-Canada a droit de l'accuser d'indifférence dans la cause de l'éducation.

L'hon. secrétaire provincial (M. Cartier) nous a dit, l'autre soir, que le gouvernement avait pris des mesures pour ouvrir des écoles normales dans le Bas-Canada. Mieux vaut tard que jamais; mais le gouvernement est si prodigues (*sic*) de promesse et si peu habitué à les tenir qu'il y a lieu d'exprimer des doutes à ce sujet. Quand je parle de l'éducation, je parle de l'éducation élémentaire. Car pour ce qui regarde l'éducation supérieure et classique, je crois que nous sommes tout aussi bien placés que le Haut-Canada, si nous ne l'emportons pas sur lui.

En comparant les statistiques des années 1853 et 1854, je vois que beaucoup de progrès ont été faits dans le Bas-Canada, sous ce rapport. Les maisons d'éducation se sont multipliées, le nombre des élèves a augmenté, et le rapport de 1854 constate que près de vingt mille enfants des deux sexes reçoivent une éducation comparative-ment libérale, et bien au-dessus d'une éducation élémentaire. Les statistiques du Haut-Canada ne montreraient pas le même résultat.

C'est donc l'éducation élémentaire surtout qu'il faut encourager, et c'est ce que le gouvernement a perdu de vue.

Une autre omission importante est celle qui a trait au commerce et à de nouveaux arrangements pour la perception du revenu. L'état de dépression dans lequel se

trouve le commerce de la province méritait toute la considération du gouvernement. Il était de son devoir d'en rechercher les causes et de soumettre ses vues sur un sujet aussi important qui occupe tellement l'opinion publique, dans le Bas-Canada, qu'un journal ministériel, la Minerve, le donne comme l'un de ceux qui réclament impérieusement l'initiative du ministère.

(M. Daoust cite ici un paragraphe de l'éditorial de la Minerve du 15 de février courant.)

Je suis bien certain d'une chose, M. l'Orateur; c'est que si la Minerve eût pu recevoir à temps le mot d'ordre, elle n'aurait pas ainsi compromis ses patrons. Mais en présence de ce témoignage, on ne peut plus douter que l'omission de toute allusion aux matières commerciales dans le discours du trône ne soit regardée par tout le Bas-Canada comme une négligence coupable de ses meilleurs intérêts.<sup>9</sup> After some further remarks on the subject of education and Normal Schools, to the same effect as those of Mr. Dorion in the early part of the debate, he went on to say that the vagueness of the amendments had been complained of, but that was caused, to a great extent, by the vagueness of the Address, which exceeded what had ever been known previously. (Hear, hear.)<sup>10</sup> On a prétendu, et l'hon. membre pour Laprairie en particulier a prétendu, lorsque nous reprochions au ministère le vague et les réticences de son programme, que le discours du trône ne devait contenir que des allusions générales aux principales mesures que le ministère entend soumettre à la chambre. Si cette assertion est vraie, comment l'hon. membre peut-il reprocher à l'opposition le vague de ses amendements? L'hon. membre est satisfait de l'adresse qui n'énonce aucune politique, aucun principe de législation; mais il veut que l'opposition se présente avec un plan de gouvernement, un programme, des mesures toutes prêtes. Autrement, il déclare que l'opposition ne peut prétendre au gouvernement du pays. Voici des prétentions extraordinaires qui ne peuvent s'appuyer sur aucun fait; car on sait parfaitement que les amendements au discours du trône sont toujours d'une nature générale et que les annales parlementaires ne fourniraient pas un seul exemple d'une opposition étalant son programme et ses mesures. Au contraire, quand les administrations succombent sur l'adresse, c'est gé[né]ralement par un amendement pur et simple ou sur la proposition d'un vote de non-confiance.

Il a plu aussi à l'hon. membre pour Laprairie de dénoncer l'opposition comme n'ayant aucuns principes. Je ne sais trop ce qu'on entend par principes de l'autre côté de la chambre; mon impression est qu'il n'y en a pas du tout, si l'on en juge par la présente combinaison ministérielle et par la conduite de ceux qui donnent leur appui à cette combinaison.

Les principes de l'opposition, au moins de cette partie de l'opposition à laquelle j'appartiens, sont devant le public depuis plusieurs années et sont parfaitement connus et appréciés dans le Bas-Canada.<sup>11</sup> The Opposition had enunciated opinions sufficiently clear, and, what was more, in accordance with the opinion of the country. (Hear, hear.)<sup>12</sup> L'hon. membre n'ignore pas quels sont ces principes et il n'ignore pas non plus que l'opinion publique est avec nous et que les réformes que nous demandons dans les institutions politiques et dans l'administration des affaires publiques de cette province sont universellement regardées comme urgentes et nécessaires. Ce que j'avance ici est tellement vrai que la coalition n'aurait pu se maintenir un instant sans endosser quelques-uns de ces principes et sans promettre expressément de les réaliser dans la législation. Je laisse à l'hon. membre pour Laprairie tout le bénéfice de ses accusations<sup>13</sup>. [M. Daoust] condamna alors la loi de milice et le projet d'établir une police provinciale et il revint à la question seigneuriale.<sup>14</sup>

Je regrette de ne pas voir à sa place l'hon. procureur-général pour le Bas-Canada (M. Drummond); j'attends de lui, le peuple du Bas-Canada attend de lui des explications sur les procédés de la commission seigneuriale et des informations

précises sur la manière en laquelle la loi a été mise à exécution. Nous sommes aujourd'hui dans la (sic) vague, dans les ténèbres, comme l'était cette chambre lorsqu'elle a été forcée de voter sur le bill seigneurial maintenant en existence sans avoir eu le temps de le lire<sup>15</sup>; et malgré cela on venait demander à la chambre un vote aveugle d'approbation, quoiqu'une majorité des membres du Bas-Canada eût, dans le temps, voté contre cette mesure. Il avait lieu de compter sur l'appui d'un grand nombre de membres du Bas-Canada, en faveur de son amendement, vu qu'un si grand nombre d'entre eux avait agi avec lui, pour repousser le bill.<sup>16</sup> En référant aux journaux de la dernière session, je vois que lorsque la seconde lecture du bill seigneurial a été proposée, la décision a été 39 pour et 33 contre, et que parmi ceux qui ont voté contre la proposition se trouvaient MM. Desaulniers, Dionne, Dufresne, Fortier de Bellechasse, Fournier, Guévremont, Lemieux, Pouliot, Taché, Thibeaudeau et Turcotte.

Je m'attends aussi à obtenir l'assentiment de l'hon. membre pour Soulanges (M. Masson) qui a déclaré, dans une assemblé[e] publique, à Montréal, que, s'il eût été à Québec, il aurait voté contre la seconde lecture de ce bill.<sup>17</sup> [Il] s'était exprimé d'une manière très énergique contre cette mesure.<sup>18</sup> Ainsi, j'aurai, je n'en doute point, le concours de douze hon. membres qui appuient l'administration mais qui, dans cette circonstance, ne pourraient voter pour le paragraphe de l'adresse sans s'exposer à être accusés d'inconsistance.

Tout ce qu'on sait aujourd'hui de l'opération de la loi seigneuriale, c'est qu'une commission a été nommée et que les juges délibèrent sur les question[s] qui leur ont été soumises par le procureur-général. De plus, il est à présumer que des sommes considérables ont été dépensées pour payer les conseils de la couronne, les frais d'impression, de rapports, de voyages, etc., et les salaires des juges assistants. Le gouvernement ne paiera pas à ces juges moins de 1000L par année chacun. Or, il y en a huit pour les deux districts de Montréal et de Québec; il y a six mois qu'ils sont en office et la probabilité est qu'ils y seront encore six mois. Voilà déjà 8000L ou à peu près, et en portant les frais de la cour seigneuriale à 10,000L je crois être au-dessous de la réalité.

Maintenant, qu'est-ce que la commission seigneuriale et quelle confiance peut-elle inspirer au public d'après la manière dont elle est présentement composée?

L'un des organes du gouvernement, à Montréal, nous dit que cette commission, depuis que M. Archambault, le ci-devant registrateur des comtés de l'Assomption et de Montcalm en a été exclus (sic), est une nullité. En effet, la Patrie, après avoir administré au gouvernement et principalement à l'hon. procureur-général pour le Bas-Canada, une verte réprimande à propos de la destitution de M. Archambault, dit:

"Maintenant que nous avons cité les faits, raisonnons un peu sur les conséquences. La destitution de M. Archambault prive la commission seigneuriale du seul homme qui pouvait être capable de rendre justice égale aux censitaires et aux seigneurs. Qu'avons-nous maintenant? M. H. Judah, homme de paille de tous les ministères, servile esclave de tous ceux qui veulent l'employer; M. Judah, qui, malgré qu'il ait une fortune indépendante, cherche toujours et partout à se procurer des places lucratives; M. Judah, trop inepte pour suivre sa profession d'avocat, mais assez cleaver (sic) pour accepter une place du gouvernement. (Les mauvaises langues disent à quel prix; nous ne le dirons pas). Toujours est-il que M. Judah (H.) n'a d'autre titre aux faveurs du gouvernement que sa position d'homme riche et disposant des fonds du Trust Loan Company, dont il a généreusement usé envers certain membre du ministère, que nous ne nommerons pas, parce que nous ne voulons pas exposer l'hon. M. Drummond."

Je ne prétends pas endosser les sentimens exprimés dans le paragraphe que je viens de lire; j'en laisse toute la responsabilité à l'auteur. Mais je dis que, en

présence de ce témoignage qui ne peut pas être considéré comme suspect, lorsque les amis du gouvernement eux-mêmes dénoncent la commission seigneuriale comme incapable, nous sommes justifiables d'exprimer des doutes, des craintes sur le résultat définitif de cette législation.

Le ministère, l'hon. procureur-général surtout nous a fait de belles promesses. Suivant lui, le coût de liquidation des droits seigneuriaux ne devait pas excéder 15,000L à 18,000L, et les cadastres pouvaient être faits dans l'espace de moins de six mois.<sup>19</sup> On a commencé par dire qu'ils seraient tous faits en trois mois ou du moins en très peu de temps; et il n'avait aucun doute que le procureur-général lui-même devait être désappointé de voir que rien n'est encore fait, depuis près d'un an.<sup>20</sup> Plus tard, j'ai entendu l'hon. procureur-général dire que ces dépenses seraient de 25,000L à 30,000L au plus, et dans douze mois d'ici, il nous dira que ces mêmes frais s'élèveront à 40,000L ou 50,000L au plus. Plus les travaux de la commission se prolongeront, et plus l'estimation de ses dépenses augmentera jusqu'à ce qu'une bonne partie du fonds soit ainsi absorbée. La loi seigneuriale pourvoit à la création d'un fonds pour le rachat des droits seigneuriaux. Depuis le 30 mai 1855, les lods et ventes sont abolis, mais les seigneurs, en vertu de la loi, doivent recevoir l'intérêt sur leur revenu réel ou approximatif provenant des lods et ventes, de six mois en six mois, à commencer au premier de janvier 1856. S'il y a un fonds, pourquoi les seigneurs n'ont-ils pas encore reçu ce qui leur est dû? Je proteste contre toute insinuation qui pourrait être faite que je veux me donner comme l'avocat des seigneurs en cette circonstance; mais chaque fois que la question seigneuriale est venue devant cette chambre, il n'est pas un membre qui n'ait protesté de son désir de rendre justice pleine et entière à toutes les parties intéressées, et c'est mal interpréter l'esprit de la loi que d'en commencer l'exécution par un acte d'injustice.<sup>21</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND dit que la loi n'obligeait pas le gouvernement de payer aux seigneurs les intérêts sur les lods et ventes au premier de janvier.<sup>22</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST.--Rien ne semble plus clair. La loi de 1855 dit que les seigneurs, à compter du 30 de mai 1855, recevront les intérêts sur leurs revenus provenant des lods et ventes, et que si, au premier de janvier 1856, tous les cadastres ne sont pas complétés, alors un ou plusieurs des commissaires, dûment autorisés, estimeront approximativement le revenu annuel des lods et ventes et paieront aux seigneurs les intérêts en conséquence, sauf à faire raison plus tard du plus ou du moins que ces derniers auront reçu.<sup>23</sup> The Seigniorial Fund, according to the Attorney General, would come to 400,000L or 500,000L, including the contributions from all sources.<sup>24</sup> Si les informations que j'ai sont correctes, les réclamations des seigneurs pour lods et ventes se montaient, il y a plus d'un mois, à 350,000L, et ce chiffre ne comprenait pas la moitié des réclamations pour le même objet. Cette information ne vient pas d'une source officielle; mais la personne qui me l'a donnée avait accès au bureau de la commission. Supposant que ce soit la moitié des réclamations, vous avez déjà 700,000L à payer, à part tous les frais de liquidation, avec un fonds de 400,000L à 450,000L.--Car on a toujours donné à entendre que non seulement l'indemnité (sic) pour lods et ventes serait payée à même le fonds seigneurial, mais encore qu'une grande proportion de l'indemnité pour les autres droits seigneuriaux le serait aussi.

Avec une telle perspective, lorsque le gouvernement n'a encore donné aucune explication et que les amis, les organes du ministère dénoncent la commission comme inutile, non seulement nous sommes justifiables, mais encore il est de notre devoir d'exprimer des craintes sur le résultat définitif de cette mesure, afin que le

peuple du Bas-Canada ne s'endorme point dans une fausse sécurité.<sup>25</sup> Voyant maintenant que la commission seigneuriale n'a encore rien fait, du moins au dire de l'organe ministériel--et spécialement du député de Verchères,--il est à peu près certain que cette loi, gauchement conçue, deviendra de pire en pire dans son exécution.<sup>26</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--Le gouvernement n'a aucun organe dans la presse et ne reconnaît à aucun journal le droit de se poser comme tel.<sup>27</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--Je nie avoir un organe.<sup>28</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST.--L'hon. membre pour Verchères se calomnie; il a un précieux organe. Je suis heureux d'apprendre que l'hon. membre répudie toute relation avec le journal auquel j'ai fait allusion, et je n'insisterai pas sur ce point. Mais tout le monde sait que certains journaux, en retour du patronage dont ils sont l'objet, donnent leur appui au gouvernement en toute occasion. Tout le monde sait aussi que la Patrie a fait une furieuse sortie contre l'hon. procureur général (M. Drummond) tout en couvrant de sa protection l'hon. secrétaire provincial (M. Cartier). J'ai donc eu raison de croire que ce journal avait la prétention de se donner plus particulièrement comme l'organe de l'hon. membre pour Verchères. Les allusions que je fais sont peut-être de nature à réveiller chez ces hon. messieurs de pénibles souvenirs, mais les nuages qui ont obscurci pour un instant les régions ministérielles dans le Bas-Canada paraissent avoir été dissipés par un nouveau souffle du patronage, et je ne doute pas que la meilleure intelligence ne règne entre l'hon. procureur-général et son collègue.<sup>29</sup> A tout événement ce journal, qu'il soit ou non un organe, a constamment appuyé le gouvernement, et malgré ses sympathies ministérielles, il est venu déclarer ouvertement que la commission seigneuriale ne faisait rien du tout.<sup>30</sup>

M. l'Orateur, je ne crains pas de le dire: l'amendement que je propose exprime les sentiments du peuple du Bas-Canada. On voit avec inquiétude les procédés de la commission seigneuriale; et en l'absence de toute information, aucune partie intéressée dans le règlement de cette question ne peut dire qu'elle soit satisfaite de ce qui a été fait, moins encore qu'elle ait confiance dans les opérations futures de la commission.

On cherche à endormir les censitaires dans une fausse sécurité; mais quand ils viendront à connaître le véritable état des choses, il est à craindre que l'agitation passée ne soit que l'ombre de celle qui soulèvera alors le peuple du Bas-Canada.

J'en appelle encore à ces hon. membres qui, durant la dernière session, ont voté, avec une majorité du Bas-Canada, contre le bill seigneurial qui nous était imposé par une majorité haut-canadienne, et je les défie de voter contre cet amendement.

Je propose donc que tous les mots après le mot "Que" dans le 4e paragraphe soient retranchés et que les suivants soient insérés à leur place:

"Que cette chambre voit avec inquiétude la lenteur des procédés qui ont été adoptés en vertu des lois passées dans la dernière session relativement à l'abolition seigneuriale, et les dépenses considérables qu'ils entraînent; et qu'elle entretient des doutes sérieux sur le résultat définitif de cette législation, et sur son efficacité à faire disparaître une agitation longue, mais juste et nécessaire."<sup>31</sup>

MR. A. COOKE (Ottawa) supported the amendment,<sup>32</sup> declaring his opinion that the Seigniorial Tenure measure could not satisfy any one at present, seeing that, until

the judges had given their decision, it was utterly impossible to know whether it was good or bad. He would not retract his condemnation of it.<sup>33</sup> He looked upon it as a tub without a bottom. He strongly condemned, also, the way in which the Bill had been passed, having been brought down from the Upper House on a Friday night, and forced through at two o'clock on Saturday morning, in the face of the strenuous opposition of a large number of the members best acquainted with the subject. On the subject of schools, he complained that, like many other parts of our system, they were made an instrument of power and patronage to the Government. The people, it was true, elected School Trustees, and hired Teachers, but Inspectors had to be appointed by the Government to supervise the whole.<sup>34</sup> The hon. member, however, was not very audible in the gallery. He afterwards read several extracts to show the ill effects of the system as at present existing.<sup>35</sup> The hon. member also referred to the distribution of the 30,000L grant for roads in the interior, and to the regulations affecting the timber trade; but his observations on those subjects were almost inaudible in the gallery.<sup>36</sup> [He] brought up several grievances against the Commissioner of Crown Lands, for the management of his office, for which, he said, the present incumbent was not altogether to blame, although there was much room for improvement in his case. The hon. gentleman quoted the law in reference to the office of Supervisor of Cullers--a part of the Crown Lands department--and stated several difficulties the lumber merchants had to encounter, in consequence of that Supervisor's office being located in Montreal. To this office the lumberer had to go--sometimes 90 miles--to get permission to cut a few thousand feet and it was not unfrequently the case that two or three individuals got licenses to cut on the same lot, thus causing considerable ill-feeling to exist. Another grievance consisted in the fact that the lumberer had to make an affidavit of every foot of timber on his raft--a thing impossible in most cases. He hoped that some steps would be taken to improve the arrangements of this office.<sup>37</sup>

MR. CHABOT, (in French)<sup>38</sup>.--Le représentant du comté de Beauharnais se plaint, M. l'Orateur, que le gouvernement l'ait laissé dans l'ignorance sur la question seigneuriale, et il trouve néanmoins le moyen d'entretenir longuement la chambre relativement à cette grande affaire, d'entasser révélations sur révélations, de prouver--dans son opinion du moins--que l'administration n'a commencé ni par le bon bout ni de la bonne manière, et de couronner enfin son discours par un amendement dans lequel il propose à la Chambre ... de se constituer en juge sévère contre le gouvernement dans une affaire à laquelle celle-ci ne doit rien comprendre selon ses propres assertions. M. l'Orateur, vous serez je le pense, de mon avis; pour un homme qui se croit dans l'obscurité, c'est marcher un peu vite sur le terrain si glissant de la Tenure Seigneuriale et, ce me semble, ce n'est pas être très impartial que de vouloir jeter du blâme sur ceux dont on avoue ne pas connaître la façon d'agir.

Cet amendement, proposé par le député de Beauharnais, fait sonner bien haut ce qu'il lui convient de nommer les lenteurs de la commission seigneuriale et le gaspillage que le gouvernement a fait des fonds publics pour la liquidation de cette affaire.

Je n'imiterai pas l'opposition, M. l'Orateur, en me plaignant de ne pas trouver dans cet amendement des arguments contre l'administration à l'appui des accusations lancées par le membre pour Beauharnais. Je sais qu'on ne peut pas tout dire dans un amendement pas plus que dans un discours du trône. Mais l'hon. représentant vient de prononcer un assez long discours pour expliquer le pourquoi de son amendement. Sa parole a volé plus ou moins légèrement sur un très grand nombre de points et notre esprit a parcouru, à la suivre, un assez vaste espace. Nous a-t-il pourtant donné la moindre preuve de ce qu'il avance dans son amendement? A-t-il en cela

satisfait notre juste attente? pas de la moindre façon; et si la chambre adopte l'amendement de l'hon. préopinant, si elle jette du blâme sur la commission seigneuriale, sur toute l'administration, c'est qu'elle opinera, les yeux fermés, sans le moindre sujet de conviction, sur la seule parole de l'hon. représentant qui, je le répète, avoue n'en pas savoir davantage sur cette question que beaucoup d'autres.

Je pourrais m'arrêter ici, M. l'Orateur. Une accusation qui n'est point étayée par des preuves devient nulle, si ce n'est jamais à l'accusé à repousser des reproches sans fondement. Je veux bien pourtant, M. l'Orateur, non pour la satisfaction du préopinant, mais pour celle de la Chambre, donner à celle-ci quelques brèves explications.

La commission seigneuriale, chargée de travaux herculéens, ayant à se débrouiller au milieu d'un enchevêtrement vraiment chastique de documents vraiment contradictoires, avait assez de besogne sur les bras pour mériter toute excuse si elle avait avancé lentement dans ce dédale. Mais il y a plus, M. l'Orateur, l'eût-elle voulu, l'eût-elle pu surtout, il lui était défendu d'arriver plus tôt au but de sa carrière. En effet, d'après les dispositions de [la] loi qui ordonne la création de la commission seigneuriale, il est spécifié que celle-ci ne devra terminer ses travaux qu'après avoir entendu la Cour Seigneuriale se prononcer sur tous les points de cette cause immense.

Il est facile, M. l'Orateur, de faire sortir de sa bouche des qualificatifs et de dire par exemple, que les questions soumises à cette cour, que les investigations confiées à cette com[m]ission pouvaient être, les unes et les autres, menées à bonne fin en un laps de temps très court et avec la plus grande facilité. Ce qui est aisé, M. l'Orateur, c'est de parler sur une affaire dont on n'a point le maniement; ce qui est vraiment difficile, c'est de conduire cette affaire:

La critique est aisée, mais l'art est difficile.

Les commissaires nommés pendant le printemps dernier ne se sont pas plutôt mis à la besogne qu'ils ont été presque effrayés à l'aspect du labyrinthe où ils avaient à s'engager.<sup>39</sup> It was a very embarrassing matter to change such a system as that of the Seigniorial Tenure. The Seigniories were so divided as to make the boundaries difficult of settlement, and that had to be done before commencing anything else, and then many other things had to be done.<sup>40</sup> Sans parler du nombre infini des seigneuries, que vous dirai-je, M. l'Orateur, de la diversité des vieilles lois, des us, des actes, des documents relatifs à chacune de ces seigneuries? C'est pourtant au milieu de ce chaos qu'il fallait tracer une voie lumineuse, c'est avec ces éléments hétérogènes, jetés tous pêle-mêle, qu'il fallait former un tout, élever un édifice. Le seul plan d'étude à suivre, la seule organisation préalable de l'administration demandaient un temps considérable. Et c'est lorsque la tâche est si difficile, lorsque le résultat est d'une si grande importance, avec de si nombreux intérêts--tous également sacrés--à sauvegarder, qu'on ose chicaner la commission pour quelques mois de plus ou de moins! (Applaudissements chaleureux.)

Mais voici venir les connaisseurs, ceux qui savent tout plus que tous les autres, qui disent d'un ton suffisant: "Vous vous plaignez de la multiplicité de travaux confiés à la commission; en ce cas, pourquoi ne pas nommer un plus grand nombre de commissaires, comme la loi vous y autorisait?" M. l'Orateur,

Il est difficile de contenter tout le monde et la gauche,

Si le gouvernement s'était décidé à nommer une légion de commissaires, comme le lui conseille l'oppo[s]ition (simplement parce qu'il ne l'a point fait,) vous auriez entendu cette même opposition jeter de grands cris sur ce qu'elle aurait nommé les moyens de patronage--tranchons le mot--de corruption mis entre les mains de l'administration. "Qu'allons-nous devenir, grand Dieu! se serait écriée l'opposition, sur tous les tons et d'une extrémité du pays à l'autre; qu'allons-nous devenir au milieu de cette foule d'employés salariés? n'en avons-nous pas assez déjà? Assurément

les revenus publics vont être dévorés jusqu'au dernier shelling par cette nuée de sauterelles administratives." (Rires et applaudissements.) Mais le gouvernement, M. l'Orateur, n'a pas voulu s'exposer à ce reproche, ni gaspiller inutilement les fonds affectés à la liquidation de cette affaire. Il n'a nommé que quatre commis-saires auxquels il a adjoint un nombre suffisant de commis, et le travail ne s'en fait que mieux et plus économiquement<sup>41</sup>; de cette manière l'ouvrage est presque fini maintenant à Québec<sup>42</sup>. Il est vrai que l'opposition crie, et M. l'Orateur, qu'y faire? laissons-la crier, puisque dans tous les cas, il est de sa nature de se montrer mécontente, d'un caractère insociable, d'une essence peu accom[m]odante.

A part la question légale, le débrouillement des énigmes qui se présentent à chaque instant dans l'étude de la cause seigneuriale, ce qui exige aussi un laps de temps considérable, ce qui n'a pas peu contribué à entraver la marche de la commission, c'est la nécessité où s'est trouvée cette dernière de dresser les listes de tous les censitaires, de spécifier la nature et la valeur des biens à libérer et de désigner le chiffre des taxes auxquelles ils sont soumis. Matériellement parlant, était-il possible de terminer ce travail en peu de temps? C'est encore la question que je ferai au représentant de Beauharnais en réponse à ce qu'il a dit des intérêts que le gouvernement aurait dû payer aux seigneurs.--S'ils (*sic*) y a un fonds, s'écrie ce député, pourquoi n'a-t-on pas payé les seigneurs?--Pourquoi? mais l'hon. membre s'est donné à lui-même la réponse en formulant sa demande. Si les cadastres ne sont pas terminés au 1er janvier 1856, nous a-t-il dit, un des membres de la commission doit dresser un état approximatif des revenus des seigneurs, pour payer à ces derniers les intérêts auxquels ils peuvent avoir droit.--Mais cet état approximatif, il faut donc le faire et le député de Beauharnais sait-il un secret qui pût forcer les seigneurs à remettre dans le plus bref délai les renseignements qu'on leur a demandés à ce sujet? Oui, le gouvernement a adressé à chaque seigneur une circulaire afin de se procurer les données indispensables pour dresser cet état approximatif. Quelques-uns des seigneurs ont obtempéré à la demande de l'administration, mais ce n'est pas la majorité. Ces lenteurs, est-ce encore à la commission qu'il faut les imputer?

Quant aux délais de la cour seigneuriale, qui oserait s'en plaindre? Elle a, M. l'Orateur, à se prononcer entre de si vastes intérêts qu'on ne saurait lui accorder trop de temps pour mûrir son verdict. Ces travaux multiples, ces petites lenteurs indispensables ont nécessité quelques dépenses, il est vrai; mais l'opposition est-elle donc à ce point déraisonnable qu'elle exige qu'une tâche pareille soit terminée sans qu'il en coûte au gouvernement? Si elle avait été chargée de ce vaste travail, aurait-elle donc laissé le budget de la province intact?<sup>43</sup> La création de la cour seigneuriale était absolument nécessaire, comme tous ceux qui ont vu ses actes en conviendront, et malgré les dépenses, qui seront sans doute considérables, le résultat sera satisfaisant pour le pays.<sup>44</sup> Quant à moi, M. l'Orateur, bien que j'éprouve un certain ennui à traiter cette question, ma position est assez délicate pour me forcer à entrer dans ces détails, peut-être trop mesquins aux yeux de la Chambre. Je fais partie, en effet, de la commission seigneuriale.<sup>45</sup>

Une voix de la gauche, qui trouve aussitôt plusieurs échos: Entendez!<sup>46</sup>

MR. CHABOT. J'espère, M. l'Orateur, que les membres qui se montrent si bien disposés à m'entendre, comprendront, tout système d'opposition quand même mis à part, qu'il ne serait pas juste, qu'il ne serait pas digne de cette Chambre de jeter, sans aucune connaissance de cause, un blâme qui, du gouvernement, rejaillirait sur la commission dont j'ai l'honneur de faire partie. Mais je n'ai aucun lieu de craindre, M. l'Orateur; l'opposition qui l'année dernière, donnait encore quelques signes de vie, l'opposition se meurt aujourd'hui sous nos yeux, tandis que

l'administration à laquelle des envieux n'accordaient que quelques jours d'existence, grandit et prend chaque jour une nouvelle vigueur. Ce n'est pas dans des accusations semblables à celles qui ont été portées contre la rédaction du discours du Trône que l'opposition trouvera l'élixir (sic) de vie. Le pays et la majorité de la Chambre comprendront que ce discours dit tout ce qu'il convenait de lui faire dire, et rien de plus, rien de moins. La Chambre donnera son adhésion à l'adresse proposée; elle repoussera tous les amendements qui auraient une intention maligne contre le gouvernement; et si je nourris une crainte, c'est de voir ce dernier trop bien appuyé, ce qui le perdrait, un jour, en lui inspirant une trop grande confiance. Espérons toutefois qu'il n'est pas encore si près de mourir de pléthore. (Marques d'approbation.)<sup>47</sup>

DR. MASSON ... next spoke in French<sup>48</sup>.--Les membres de l'opposition, doués à différents degrés du don de prophétie, nous ont annoncé à diverses reprises la chute de l'administration. Plusieurs fois déjà, le pays s'est préparé à ce grand événement; mais il s'est toujours trouvé agréablement désappointé, et aujourd'hui enfin, il cessera de craindre en apprenant le résultat du dernier vote: 72 voix contre 33, c'est plus, en effet, qu'il n'en faut pour inspirer de la confiance aux plus timides.

Cette confiance que la grande majorité du peuple a en l'administration, on nous demande aujourd'hui de la lui retirer à propos de la question de la tenure seigneuriale; mais, comme disent ceux des hons. membres qui l'expriment en anglais, je ne suis nullement préparé à écouter ce conseil perfide de l'opposition.

L'hon. auteur de l'amendement qui nous occupe, m'a fait un reproche indirect de ne pas avoir été présent lors de la passation du bill de la tenure seigneuriale. Il a encore ajouté que j'étais néanmoins opposé à cette loi et qu'il espérait, par conséquent, me trouver en faveur de son amendement.

J'en suis fâché pour lui, M. l'Orateur, mais l'hon. membre s'est bercé d'un espoir trompeur; et en cela, je sais fort bien ce que je fais. Il ne faut pas, en effet, que les honorables de la gauche se figurent être les seuls à visiter leurs comtés respectifs. (rires généraux.) J'ai parcouru moi aussi le comté qui m'a honoré d'un mandat; j'ai sondé l'opinion de mes commettants, dans mon désir d'être l'écho fidèle de leurs vœux et non celui des jalousies d'un parti, j'ai demandé à la grande masse de mes électeurs ce qu'ils pensaient du bill de la question seigneuriale, et l'opposition tient-elle à le savoir?--mes électeurs sont satisfaits. Quant à moi, devrais-je être assez ignorant des devoirs d'un vrai représentant, pour mettre mon opinion, quelle qu'elle fût, au-dessus de celle du peuple dont je ne dois être que l'interprète? Et d'ailleurs, si j'étais d'abord opposé au bill, j'ai eu tout lieu de me raviser en voyant les amendements qu'on y avait introduits. A présent, je suis donc partisan du bill et surtout de la clause qui offre aux censitaires 500,000 louis pour les aider à se libérer entièrement. Je pense que les démocrates, purs ou non, ne voient pas non plus de mauvais oeil cette clause-là. (rires et applaudissements.)

Cet amendement que l'hon. membre pour Beauharnais m'offre de si bon coeur, mais dont je ne veux pas, est, comme ceux qui l'ont précédé, une attaque contre le style du discours du trône. Ne serait-ce qu'à cause de cela, je le repousserais; j'approuve ce discours, en effet, et puisqu'on a tant parlé du péché d'omission, je dirai que je n'y en vois pas d'autre que de ne pas avoir mentionné le chemin de fer<sup>49</sup> du Nord<sup>50</sup>. C'est là, en effet, une entreprise qui intéresse une grande partie de la province, qui doit contribuer au plus haut point au développement des ressources presque inconnues du Bas-Canada et dont l'exécution ne devrait plus être différée. J'espère que les membres de la Chambre, en faveur de ce grand projet,

forceront, pour ainsi dire, le cabinet à s'en occuper immédiatement, à en faire même une question d'intérêt national.

Si je viens de dire ouvertement ce que j'aurais aimé à trouver dans le discours du trône, j'ajouterais non moins franchement que j'approuve tout ce qui s'y trouve, même le bill de la police contre lequel on s'est élevé avec tant de force.<sup>51</sup>

Rumeurs à gauche.<sup>52</sup>

[DR. MASSON:] Oh! oui, tant que vous voudrez; mais après toutes ces marques d'indignation vertueuse et patriotique, que le représentant de Jacques Quartier (*sic*), que les membres pour tous les comtés traversés par une voie ferrée disent, en toute candeur, si les rassemblements de terrassiers que nécessitent les travaux des chemins de fer, n'amènent pas avec plus ou moins de fréquence, mais du moins invariablement, des émeutes qu'une police bien organisée pourrait seule étouffer à leur naissance. L'organisation de ce corps est reconnue indispensable dans les villes; je ne la crois pas moins utile sur plusieurs points de la campagne, et c'est parce que je suis sûr que la majorité des membres est de la même opinion, que je n'insisterai pas davantage.<sup>53</sup> Il dit qu'il avait jusqu'à présent supporté le gouvernement, excepté sur la question de l'augmentation des salaires, et qu'il le supporterait encore tant qu'il croirait que les ministres travailleraient pour le bien du pays; mais qu'il pensait qu'ils avaient besoin d'être veillés de près; qu'il fallait avec eux être toujours sur les épines.<sup>54</sup>

MR. CHAPPAIS addressed the House at some length, in French<sup>55</sup>.--L'hon. auteur de l'amendement a quitté un instant la question de la tenure seigneuriale pour faire une pointe sur l'état de l'enseignement dans le Bas-Canada. Il s'est fourvoyé. Je ne veux point relever toutes ses erreurs, puisque, ne portant pas sur l'amendement, elles perdent beaucoup de leur importance; mais je me contenterai de le remettre sur le bon chemin relativement au sujet des diplômes. Il fait un reproche sérieux aux commissaires des écoles d'avoir reçu un très-grand nombre d'instituteurs sans diplôme. Peut-être ne sait-il pas ou plutôt a-t-il oublié qu'en vertu de l'article 24 de la loi 9 Vict., les institutrices ne sont pas tenues de se munir de diplômes; or sur 2,352 écoles éparses dans le Bas-Canada, il s'en trouve 1,493 sous la direction d'institutrices, et encore parmi ces dernières, faut-il en compter quelques-unes qui ont leurs diplômes; le chiffre des instituteurs reçus contrairement aux dispositions de la loi, se trouve, en conséquence réduit à 234. Quant à l'éducation classique donnée dans le Bas-Canada, entreprendrais-je d'en faire l'éloge, lorsqu'on voit dans nos écoles supérieures 2,500 jeunes gens, tandis qu'on n'en compte que 800 dans celles du Haut-Canada?

L'opposition, traquée sur ce coin, se rejettera sur la question de l'enseignement primaire, et, là-dessus, les amis mêmes du gouvernement, les défenseurs les plus zélés du Bas-Canada seront prêts à faire des concessions, à baisser pavillon. Et pourquoi tant se hâter? qu'en est-il besoin? Je vois dans un des derniers rapports que l'augmentation des élèves qui fréquentent les écoles communales a été, pendant un an, de 13,000 dans le Haut-Canada et de 11,000 dans le bas de la Province. Faites la par[t], d'une légère différence numérique dans la population respective des deux parties du Canada, ainsi que de quelques autres causes intéressantes à la géographie du Bas-Canada, et vous verrez que ce dernier n'a nul besoin de se sentir humilié devant les progrès faits par le Haut-Canada dans la question de l'enseignement. N'est-ce donc pas gratuitement que des représentants de la population française se sont plu à faire rougir par leurs paroles tous ceux qui sont fiers du vieux Canada! (Applaud.) Ils se sont longuement étendus sur le besoin d'une

école normale, tandis qu'ils savent fort bien que nos collèges en tiennent presque lieu. Ces écoles normales, nous les aurons bientôt pourtant, et ici qu'il me soit permis d'ajouter qu'en raison de l'immoralité relative qui règne presque toujours dans les grands centres, ainsi que du haut prix des pensions, il serait préférable de placer ces écoles normales dans les campagnes, d'autant plus que la salubrité dont elles jouissent d'ordinaire serait une nouvelle garantie donnée aux parents. Je n'irai pas plus loin sur ce sujet, me réservant de le discuter de nouveau quand il arrivera devant la Chambre. Quant à ce qui nous occupe aujourd'hui, à l'amendement relatif à la question seigneuriale, je le repousse, parce qu'il implique un blâme et que je veux pouvoir juger, avoir eu les pièces en mains avant de condamner. Si, comme le dit l'hon. député de Beauharnais, nous sommes dans le vague, dans l'obscurité, attendons d'être éclairés, d'avoir sous les yeux quelque chose de tangible avant de nous prononcer. Cette liquidation qui doit, dit-on, ruiner le peuple, se fera sans amener un si effroyable (*sic*) malheur. Pour ne parler que d'un fait entre mille,<sup>56</sup> il avait été informé par le seigneur de St. Roch des Aulnets, que dans sa seigneurie le montant total des droits seigneuriaux ne s'élèverait qu'à quarante-deux piastres par chaque terre de 84 arpents,<sup>57</sup> si la commission d'enquête faisait droit à toutes ses demandes.... Retranchez de cette somme ce que le gouvernement doit payer, en déduction des charges des censitaires au moyen du fonds voté par la Législature et vous trouverez environ \$32, par 84 arpens, que le censitaire aura à payer. Y a-t-il là tant de quoi gémir et s'effrayer? On veut nous faire peur avec des chimères; mais, quant à moi, j'ai confiance en l'administration et je vote contre l'amendement.<sup>58</sup>

MR. DESAULNIERS ... in French<sup>59</sup>.--L'hon. membre pour Beauharnais m'a désigné, M. l'Orateur, comme devant avec 11 de mes collègues de la droite, appuyer son amendement, parce que dans le temps nous nous sommes prononcés contre le bill de la Tenure Seigneuriale. L'hon. membre s' imagine qu'il nous met dans une si grande difficulté que nous ne pouvons pas en sortir; je peux sans gêne et sans crainte, lui dire qu'il se trompe, et que pour avoir voté, avec lui, contre le bill seigneurial, je ne me crois nullement tenu de voter en faveur de son amendement.<sup>60</sup> Though he and others felt they would not at the time it was passed support the Seigniorial Tenure bill, [they] would now, and did heartily, and without inconsistency, support the ministry for Lower Canada, in whom they had confidence. That act had been passed by the representatives of the people, those who spoke the views and the will of the people, and he believed Ministers would carry the act honestly into effect, without sacrificing the interests of the people.<sup>61</sup>

Que nous dit l'hon. membre pour nous engager à appuyer son amendement? nous sommes dans le vague, nous ne savons rien; le gouvernement ne nous a pas dit ce qu'il a fait; mais, M. l'Orateur, que nous dit l'hon. membre? nous donne-t-il des renseignements à ce sujet, nous offre-t-il plus de lumière? Non, son amendement augmente encore l'obscurité. Puisque nous ne savons donc rien ni des actes du gouvernement, ni des visées, des intentions (*sic*) et des moyens de l'opposition, j'aime encore mieux rester à côté de l'administration, parce que j'ai confiance en elle. L'opposition d'ailleurs tend à nous induire en erreur, mais le gouvernement dans lequel nous avons confiance, et que nous supportons, ne peut pas, lui, vouloir nous tromper. N'est-il pas naturel que jusqu'à preuve du contraire, nous pensions que nos amis sont dignes de notre appui?<sup>62</sup>

Un membre de la gauche.--Ah! Ah!<sup>63</sup>

MR. DESAULNIERS.--Eh! oui; nos amis, j'ai dit le mot; faut-il donc se cacher [d'être] des amis du gouvernement. En ce cas, la grande masse du peuple aurait à se

cacher, car elle est en faveurs (sic) de l'administration actuelle et les membres de l'opposition (sic) qui sont sans cnse (sic) à parler de la volonté du peuple, comme d'une chose devant laquelle il n'y a plus qu'à s'incliner; eux qui, sans cesse en cette Chambre, et dans leurs journaux, font retentir si haut le mot de peuple; eux qui, sous prétexte que le peuple n'a pas demandé de bill de police, reprochent à l'hon. procureur-général de le proposer, devraient bien nous dire, si le peuple demande, soit par pétition, soit par la voix de la majorité de ses représentants, l'abolition des dîmes, les parlements an[n]uels, les Juges de Paix électifs, &c., &c.<sup>64</sup> Where was the expression of the popular will against the Seigniorial Tenure Bill? Where was the expression of opinion in favor of that great measure of the Opposition--the abolition of tithes?<sup>65</sup> A entendre ces messieurs, toujours parler du peuple, à lire leurs journaux, avec les beaux principes qu'ils émettent, on dirait qu'il[s] vont ramener l'âge d'or, la vie pastorale, et que nous n'aurons plus à l'avenir qu'à garder nos troupeaux et à étendre les principes de la pure démocratie!!!!

Non, M. l'Orateur, le peuple ne demande pas plus les mesures présentées par l'opposition, qu'il n'a demandé le bill de police. Cependant, je crois bien sincèrement que ce bill passera à l'état de loi et qu'il sera soutenu par la majorité des représentants du peuple. Ce sera là, la meilleure preuve que la majorité du peuple le veut. En vérité, les honorables de l'opposition feraient bien mieux, puisqu'ils veulent tout ce que le peuple désire, de passer tous dans les rangs des ministériels.<sup>66</sup>

[Mr. Desaulniers] next referred to the meeting held in Laprairie by the Rouges to injure the sitting member. According to their showing, there were only 250 electors present,--not the number to be found in any one of the six parishes comprising the county. Thus they strove everywhere to raise opposition by intrigues.<sup>67</sup> C'est, sans doute, pour se soumettre à la volonté du peuple que les membres français de la gauche conseillent au représentant de Laprairie de remettre son mandat. Le Pays a essayé de tirer tout le parti possible d'une petite réunion de quelques honnêtes gens, menés et dupés par quatre ou cinq intrigants (sic), où prenant avantage de l'absence forcée du représentant, on mit ce dernier en accusation, et, après quelques minutes d'information, sans même entendre l'accusé, on le condamna sans appel à remettre son mandat. Pour professer un si grand amour du peuple, il me semble, M. l'Orateur, que les hommes qui firent passer cette résolution--et encore ne fût-elle pas reçue à l'unanimité--n'avaient pas en réalité un bien grand respect pour la volonté du peuple du comté de Laprairie qu'ils voulaient ainsi priver de son député, à la sourdine.<sup>68</sup> Malgré l'assemblée de Laprairie, son ami, M. Loranger, possédait la confiance de ses électeurs; ... cette assemblée n'était pas assez nombreuse pour exprimer l'opinion du comté et ... si M. Loranger eût été présent l'assemblée ne l'aurait pas censuré comme elle l'avait fait.<sup>69</sup>

La haine que certains hommes portent au membre pour Laprairie, a son origine dans l'appui que celui-ci donne au gouvernement; et la cause apparente de l'animosité de la gauche contre l'administration se trouve dans le mépris que l'opposition professe pour la coalition.<sup>70</sup> The caucus held by the Lower Canadian members before the formation of the Coalition Ministry had been misrepresented. It had been said they agreed to oppose the Tory Coalition; in the evening that they had dreamed fine dreams, and waked up in the morning to support them. That was not true. They agreed not to support a Tory policy, but if the Conservatives would adopt their policy to give them their support and assistance.... The opposition was blaming the Lower Canadian Ministerialists for allying themselves with Tories like the gallant Knight from Hamilton, because they had one time in 1837 combatted against them<sup>71</sup>. S'être allié à des torys! s'écrient-ils en tendant les bras vers le ciel. Eh! tout beau; que nous fait à nous, le passé de ces torys? Le MacNab de 1837 et de 1849

est-il donc celui de 1856?<sup>72</sup> Il exprima la confiance qu'il avait dans Sir Allan McNab depuis qu'il avait changé de principes. Il n'était plus l'homme de 1837 et de 1849.<sup>73</sup> Ce n'est pas sur le passé que nous fondons nos espérances, mais sur le présent et, ce présent, M. l'Orateur, les membres de la gauche devraient ne pas y songer, car il les écrase.--De notre côté, il nous montre, en effet, alliés à des hommes qu'autrefois on pouvait appeler torys, mais qui aujourd'hui appuient franchement les mesures les plus libérales. Et de leur côté, M. l'Orateur, le présent les montre bras dessus, bras dessous, épaule contre épaule avec le député de Lambton, travaillant au renversement du gouvernement, pour s'asseoir ensemble au pouvoir! Des représentants du Bas-Canada alliés au membre pour Lambton, à l'homme qui, dans son passé et dans son présent, déploie le plus de haine pour la race canadienne! Est-ce donc la VOLONTÉ DU PEUPLE CANADIEN qui a consacré cette alliance profane?<sup>74</sup>

[Mr. Desaulniers ajouta qu'il] ne voyait pas la nécessité d'un bill de judicature; le public ne le désirait pas; c'était les avocats qui avaient intérêt à faire passer cette mesure pour abolir la cour des commissaires et venir s'établir dans les campagnes, car il y en avait la moitié qui n'avaient pas les moyens de vivre dans les villes.... Il reprocha aux démocrates de se répandre dans les campagnes dans les temps d'élections et prétendit que la prospérité du Bas-Canada était aussi grande que celle du Haut.<sup>75</sup>

Je termine, M. l'Orateur, en répétant à l'hon. membre pour Beauharnais, que je ne crains pas de voter contre son amendement et que, tout en désapprouvant encore aujourd'hui l'acte seigneurial, je ne trouve rien à blâmer dans ce qui a été fait jusqu'à ce jour en vertu de cet acte.<sup>76</sup>

MR. LORANGER spoke in English<sup>77</sup>.--M. l'Orateur, je ne me serais pas levé en ce moment pour contribuer ainsi à la durée déjà trop longue de ces débats, si je n'avais cru de mon devoir de ne pas laisser passer sans répondre quelques observations du député qui s'est chargé (sic) aujourd'hui d'ouvrir les débats. L'hon. membre vient d'adresser au gouvernement cet éternel reproche que les échos de cette salle doivent s'être fatigués à reproduire depuis huit jours; le discours du trône n'a pas été assez explicite, dit-il; il aurait dû mentionner telle mesure, en expliquer telle autre, voir même développer ses plans sur cette troisième et coetera (sic). Voyez, ajoute l'hon. membre pour Beauharnais, ce que l'administration fait quant à la question si vitale de la tenure seigneuriale. Le peuple demande à être éclairé sur ce sujet qui l'intéresse au plus haut point, et pourtant l'administration le laisse plongé dans l'obscurité où il se trouve depuis la naissance de cette affaire.

On nous l'a dit si souvent que nous savons à présent à quoi nous en tenir. Il est décidé que l'administration a eu tort de se montrer si concise, qu'elle aurait dû, par exemple, placer dans le discours du trône des paragraphes aussi intéressants qu'instructifs sur toutes les questions qu'un député canadien peut avoir à approfondir. C'est fort bien. Mais, lorsqu'on a la lumière, faut-il la tenir sous le boisseau? Lorsqu'on connaît la bonne route, doit-on conduire ses semblables sur les mauvaises voies? Assurément non, et nous avons tout droit de nous attendre à voir les membres de l'opposition qui savent discourir si bien contre le laconisme coupable des autres, ne pas tomber dans la même faute; et s'ils pêchent, que ce ne soit pas du moins par omission, comme ils se plaisent tant à répéter que le gouvernement vient de le faire; que ce soit plutôt par surabondance de paroles, par loquacité.

C'est bien aussi ce qu'ils ne manquent pas de faire quand l'un d'eux trouve la Chambre attentive, quand il ne s'agit que de parler et de récriminer; mais faut-il rédiger le moindre bout d'amendement, eux qui se montrent si amoureux de la lumière, nous laissent pourtant, par leurs amendements, dans une obscurité aussi grande que jamais.<sup>78</sup> If the Government have been so very chary with use of words in framing

the speech, the Opposition certainly had little to complain of, for they have been equally chary in preparing their amendments. In fact the amendments submitted by the Opposition say very little and they mean nothing at all, although these hon. gentlemen would wish to imply by them a censure upon the Government.<sup>79</sup>

Prenons par exemple, le bill de la Tenure Seigneuriale et l'amendement proposé par l'hon. membre pour Beauharnois. Que trouvons-nous dans ce dernier qui dise rien de plus que le paragraphe du discours du trône relatif à cette question?

De grands cris ont retenti, M. l'Orateur, autour de ce bill de la Tenure Seigneuriale. Dans le Bas-Canada, il a rencontré sur quelques points la plus bruyante opposition, et M. le député auquel je réponds ne s'est pas fait faute de représenter cette mesure comme tyrannique, attentatoire aux droits du peuple et décidément un obstacle, un empêchement à la prospérité du pays. Aux hustings, dans les colonnes des journaux, partout enfin où l'opposition trouvait le moyen de s'élever contre cette mesure, elle ne se faisait pas faute de l'employer.<sup>80</sup> It may be remembered that a Seigniorial Bill received the approbation of a great majority of the house when the Parliament of Canada was sitting in Toronto, but it failed on the floor of the Legislative Council. When Parliament met in Quebec a similar Bill, to a certain extent was prepared by the same hon. gentleman (the Attorney General East) who had prepared the previous measure. This was before the Bill was passed increasing the number of representatives. It is somewhat remarkable, that although the opposition had not opposed the Bill in Toronto, they at once opposed it when submitted in Quebec, although the two bills were nearly alike, and if the Attorney General produced one disposition they demanded another. If he said white they said black, and if he said black they said white.<sup>81</sup> Le Proc.-Gén. ... rencontra une opposition à laquelle il avait droit de ne pas s'attendre, une opposition de parti pris...; une de ses (sic) oppositions M. l'Orateur, qui sont sans fin, parce que nul argument ne convai[n]cra, nulle éloquence ne persuadera celui qui, dès le début, s'est résolu à ne se laisser ni convaincre, ni persuader. On perdit un temps précieux à parcourir dans tous les sens le terrain de la discussion sur ce bill. Le Proc.-Gén. prenait-il une position, l'opposition s'échappait aussitôt dans une autre direction.<sup>82</sup> But it was very evident that their hatred of the feudal system was simply a pretence. It was the platform upon which they wished to rise to public favor, and in Quebec they went perhaps to the extreme in this subject. They opposed the bill step by step and clause by clause; but in spite of the exertions of the hon. member for L'Assomption, and the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion), and in spite of the exertions of his colleague the hon. member for Lambton, of whom by the way, the hon. member for Montreal is now ashamed, and whom he now renounces, this Bill passed the House by a large majority. It nevertheless met with the disapprobation of the Legislative Council in Quebec as it had done in Toronto<sup>83</sup>. The second bill was not lost in the Upper House, but it was so amended as to render it distasteful to many members of the Lower House. That was beyond their control or the control of ministers. The true friends of reform believed it better, however, to accept that bill, imperfect as it was rather than agitate the country longer or imperil the future success of the reform.<sup>84</sup> [OR] Notwithstanding the desire of this House to have the Bill as first passed, it was thought better to take the bill sent down from the Legislative Council than to have nothing at all. The country required something and the House consequently concurred in the amendments which had been proposed in the Legislative Council. He was free to admit that the Opposition had some cause for opposing the amended Bill, because there were some of the amendments of which he himself disapproved. But the Bill was passed.<sup>85</sup> What was the duty of good citizens when such a measure became the law of the land? Was it to incite the people to oppose the execution of the law as had been done by members opposite, more especially by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska? Was it to write and send

through the country incendiary pamphlets, and publish in the newspapers articles full of inflammatory passages...?<sup>86</sup> Et de quel oeil le pays doit-il voir l'opposition conseiller au peuple de s'élever contre elle? Les hommes composant l'opposition, M. l'Orateur, se sont exposés d'autant plus à la réprobation des citoyens patriotes, qu'ils [se] sont plus mis en évidence et qu'ils ont plus cherché à acquérir de l'influence sur leurs compatriotes. Ces hommes, parmi lesquels figuraient les représentants de l'Assomption et de Montréal, se mirent à écrire et à parler, à conseiller la désobéissance, et par conséquent le soulèvement, à inonder de leur encre, quelques coins de la presse et à jeter des pamphlets dans la foule. Pour donner un échantillon de leur manière de conduire cette polémique, de leur phrase déclamatoire et de leurs intentions subversives, voici une ligne qui parut un jour, hypocrite et furibonde dans les colonnes du Pays, l'organe de leur parti, rédigé même, sinon par ces députés eux-mêmes, du moins par un comité de collaboration qui les touche de bien près:

"CITOYENS! VOUS ÊTES 300,000<sup>87</sup> [OU] 600,000<sup>88</sup> ET LES SEIGNEURS 300; VOYEZ CE QUE VOUS AVEZ À FAIRE!"

Le sens perfide de ces paroles n'est-il pas évident et est-ce le fait des citoyens loyaux, d'hommes honnêtes, de législateurs, M. l'Orateur, d'exciter ainsi le peuple au mépris des lois?<sup>89</sup>

It being now 6 o'clock MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair.<sup>90</sup>

After the adjournment,

MR. LORANGER continued his remarks on the history of the Seigniorial Tenure Question.<sup>91</sup> He said on speaking of the Seigniorial Bill of 1854, he inadvertently mentioned it as having passed in Toronto, while he should have said Quebec. When that Bill was passed, hon. gentlemen still kept up their opposition. They denounced it as an injurious measure, as being destructive of all peace and happiness to the censitaires. They were told they were in a worse position by this Bill than before. Hon. gentlemen did not feel satisfied with the opposition they had given to the measure before the House. On the 11th January<sup>92</sup> [OR] 18 janvier 1855,<sup>93</sup> a great meeting was held of the rear guard and vanguard of the party at the Canadian Institute at Montreal.<sup>94</sup> At that meeting speeches were made by the hon. members for Montreal and L'Assomption. They denounced the Bill as being most obnoxious. Calculations were made, and such calculations as would surprise the House if he would only state them. It was stated that the execution of the Law would swallow the entire sum appropriated to the redemption of the censitaires.<sup>95</sup> It was said there that the Court would cost 40,000L; the notices in the papers 10,000L; and other similar absurd statements to alarm the people. Pamphlets were also written; one particularly, entitled, "Paie pauvre peuple! paie!" in which one clause of the law was deliberately falsified. The writer did not stick even at that.<sup>96</sup> Après les articles des journaux et les libelles, on eut recours aux pétitions. Il n'y avait pas, en ces temps-là, d'obscur soldat de la bande démocrate qui n'eût sans cesse ses poches pleines de pétitions prêt à les faire signer par toute personne qui venait en son chemin. On eût ainsi des noms de toutes les portées, représentant des personnes de tous les sexes et de tous les âges; et, pour ce que j'en sais, des enfants ont eu l'honneur de voir leurs noms compter dans les pétitions contre le règlement de la question Seigneuriale.<sup>97</sup> When the Hon. Provincial Secretary went to Vercheres to his election,<sup>98</sup> the whole Rouge party<sup>99</sup> went then and used every possible exertion to get him defeated. A letter was written, inducing, and exciting the people to oppose him, and in that letter they gave a false statement in regard to the vote of the Honorable Provincial Secretary in regard to the indemnity clause, while the writer of that letter knew very well, that the honorable member for Vereheres (sic)

had voted against the indemnity clause. At church doors accusations were made against him<sup>100</sup>. He was opposed on the ground of that measure, distorted to suit their views, yet they failed to defeat him.<sup>101</sup> Was it the act of good men, of good citizens to oppose the law when it had received the sanction of a great majority of the Legislature. Was it the act of good citizens to induce the people to resist the execution of the law. If they were satisfied that the law was not as good as they expected, after it had passed, and after from 450,000L to 500,000L had been voted to redeem its censitaires, instead then of using all their exertions to resist the law they should have helped the Administration to execute [it], if they had, as they pretended to have, the welfare of the censitaires and their redemption from the immense burdens which had been heaped upon them.<sup>102</sup> Certain amendments were introduced, at the instigation of the Opposition, but still they continued to oppose the law. The Seigniorial Court had been made the subject of many complaints, and false accusations.<sup>103</sup>

L'hon. membre pour Beauharnais, se faisant en cela l'écho du député de Montréal, semble penser que les hommes chargés de donner une solution à cette immense question (sic), énormément embrouillée, travaillent avec trop de lenteur. Mais ceux qui ont la moindre idée de la tâche difficile dévolue à la Cour, composée des premiers juges des Cours du Bas-Canada, exprimeraient une toute autre opinion, pourvu toutefois que l'animosité politique leur permit de parler avec franchise.

Vous avez entendu, l'autre jour, M. l'Orateur, le représentant de la cité de Montréal<sup>104</sup> (M. Dorion)<sup>105</sup> nous assurer que toutes ces questions relatives à la grande affaire seigneuriale sont d'une solution facile.

Tous les hommes de loi connaissent la profondeur des connaissances de Merlin, une des gloires de la magistrature française, un des hommes qui ont versé le plus de lumière sur la jurisprudence de son pays. Eh! bien, monsieur l'Orateur, après que l'orage révolutionnaire de 1789 eût balayé du sol de France le grand système féodal qui s'y trouvait enraciné depuis plus de 9 siècles, bien qu'on eût déjà écrit sur ce système et pendant sa longue vie des milliers de livres, Merlin ne craignit pas de déclarer, avec la modestie du talent et du génie, que ce système n'était pas encore parfaitement compris. Et pourtant l'hon. membre pour Montréal nous assure, en 1856, que rien n'était plus facile que de trancher ces questions. Entre le grand Merlin et le député de la cité de Montréal, je laisse à la Chambre à juger.<sup>106</sup>

The Seigniorial Court was convened on the 5th September last. It had been said that the time between the closing of last session and the convening of the Court was too great. He denied that, for both Counsel and Judges required time to consider<sup>107</sup> those important questions, which none of them esteemed easy questions like the hon. member for Montreal.<sup>108</sup> There could be no doubt that the questions submitted to the judges were of immense magnitude, because they had to determine whether injustice had been done by the Seigniors, or whether the rights they claimed were legal. Every one seemed to understand so but the hon. member for Montreal.<sup>109</sup> He (Mr. Loranger) had the honor of being appointed one of the Counsel to represent the Government.<sup>110</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE.--Hear! hear!<sup>111</sup>

MR. LORANGER.--The hon. member for Haldimand cried hear, hear, but he could tell that hon. gentleman, that he never put pen to a question so difficult, however many thousand articles he might have written for the newspapers.<sup>112</sup> He [Mr. L.] had been chosen to argue the case on behalf of the crown, not he believed, out of any favoritism, but he could say it in all humility, as necessary to his justification, because he was considered able to argue it.<sup>113</sup> (Ironical hear, hear.) If hon. gentlemen doubted that, let them ask the Judges and the public, whether he had not

properly argued the case. He thought it necessary to make this statement, after what had been said in regard to his appointment by the hon. member for L'Assomption, (Mr. Papin), yesterday. It had been said that the Court were taking too long time to consider the questions submitted. But when his learned associate, Mr. Cherrier, after a whole year's study of the question, had taken days to lay it before the Court, he did not think the Judges could have been expected to render judgment hastily.<sup>114</sup> The case was submitted at length by counsel on both sides.<sup>115</sup> The decision of the judges was expected ... [on] the 25th of February<sup>116</sup> [OR] le 29 du mois courant;<sup>117</sup> [but] the illness of some of the Judges and the long session of Queen's Bench at Quebec had prevented a decision on the day first fixed. It had been again pos[t]poned till the 6th of March.<sup>118</sup> In these circumstances he asked was it praiseworthy on the part of the Opposition, to bring forward such an amendment, blaming the Judges and the ministry and the execution of the law, for the purpose of overthrowing the government. Another subject was alluded to yesterday by the member for L'Assomption.--That hon. member had accused him (Mr. L.) of servility in this House.... He defied the member for L'Assomption to get up and show how he (Mr. L.) had been guilty of servility. His being employed in the Seigniorial Court he looked upon as an honor, rather than as a reward of servility. All the fee he received would not be compensation for the loss of a year's practice at the bar, and he believed his practice was as great as that of any of those hon. gentlemen who now taunted him<sup>119</sup> [OR] as any barrister in Montreal<sup>120</sup>. He said that he had not only been accused of servility in this House, but that his constituents had accused him of servility. (Hear, hear.) Many charges had been brought against him in the Pays. At one time the name of the member for Beauharnois was attached responsibly to the paper, but now it was conducted by a committee of collaborateurs. These gentlemen, none of them daring to put their names to their articles, had endeavoured to excite the minds of his (Mr. Loranger's) constituents against him. The hon. member then went into a variety of details as to meetings held against him in the County of Laprairie<sup>121</sup>. Quelques uns des hommes assis à votre gauche, M. l'Orateur, se sont donnés la mission peu honorable d'intriguer dans le comté que j'ai l'honneur de représenter. Profitant de mon absence, par l'entremise de quelques uns de leurs amis, hommes sans conséquence, ils ont réuni un petit nombre d'électeurs, les ont endoctrinés, et puis cet embryon d'assemblée, parlant à ma personne, au nom de la nation, m'a enjoint de remettre mon mandat ou de changer de conduite. J'ai méprisé les meneurs, j'ai plaint les électeurs qui se laissaient ainsi mener, et me voici encore, prêt à repousser toute méchante attaque lancée contre moi et à défendre contre le ramassis démocrate les principes que je tiens à honneur de professer.<sup>122</sup> It was by such base acts the Opposition hoped to succeed in Lower Canada, but they had not achieved any great success even in his county, where he had not been invited to meet them, and they were (sic) acting behind his back.<sup>123</sup> In conclusion he would say that the proceedings of the French opposition this session showed that they were still allied as before with the member for Lambton, and he wished the House to understand that the red party in Lower Canada was the same as the Brown party in Upper Canada.<sup>124</sup> Les principes (sic) subversifs dont il se fait l'apôtre--que les Haut-Canadiens y prennent garde, s'ils laissent le parti Brown triompher, car en ouvrant la porte du pouvoir à celui-ci, l'autre se fauilera sûrement à la suite. Les principes odieux exposés par l'honorable membre pour Lambton et chaque jour défendus par le Globe que les Bas-Canadiens y prennent garde, s'ils laissent le parti rouge prendre de la force, car en protégeant ce dernier, ils réchauffent dans leur sein ce serpent fanatique qui siffle déjà l'injure, qui traite les catholiques d'ignorants et d'immoraux, d'immoraux entendez-vous! cet homme qui a pour eux de la haine et qui les écraserait sous son talon si ses forces égalaient ses désirs.

(L'orateur reprend sa place au milieu d'une confusion à laquelle les murmures ont autant de part que les applaudissements.)<sup>125</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE then rose and said that the hon. gentleman the member for Lapra[i]rie had just told them that his practice at the bar of Montreal was as good as any barrister there; but he (Mr. M.) would say (*sic*) that if such were really the case, they must be hard up for lawyers in Montreal.<sup>126</sup> (Laughter.)<sup>127</sup> That hon. gentleman had also informed them that he had been chosen as Council, to argue the question of the Seigniorial Tenure, because the question was a difficulty<sup>128</sup> [OR] on account of his talents and knowledge, and so forth.<sup>129</sup> He must say, however, that the less said by that hon. gentleman and the others who had been associated with him on this affair, the better. By this iniquitous act,<sup>130</sup> Mr. Chabot<sup>131</sup> the hon. and learned Commissioner for Public Works, was instrumental in taking some \$1,825,000 out of the pockets of the people of Canada. And yet, another result of the act was that four hon. gentlemen had to be appointed at a salary of 1,000L each, to settle the matter.<sup>132</sup> He believed, however, that if the hon. gentleman had given better votes than he had done, the \$2,000 he had received would have gone into some other pocket.<sup>133</sup> It was but another version of the old story about the monkey, the cheese and the cat; hon. members had been so conscientious that they kept dividing and subdividing in this matter, until it had been all swallowed up, (laughter). At all events he thought that if the bar of Montreal had no abler advocate than the hon. member who had just sat down, it would scarcely stand very high in public estimation. He (Mr. M.) would maintain that they did not want that bill. The people of Upper Canada had protested against it. But like many other Bills, it was brought in, as he supposed, to enable the people of Lower Canada to command the purse, and draw on the resources of this enterprising Province. That it was that hon. gentlemen in that House, who sat in that House at the expense of the country, were enabled to despoil the richest portion of the Province for the sustentation of the poorest and most worthless part. This was the manner in which the interests of the Province were protected by hon. gentlemen of that house--which, as had been justly observed on the previous evening was, a very strange society, indeed--one half of the hon. gentlemen being in blissful ignorance of what the remaining hal[f] said. (Laughter.)<sup>134</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order.<sup>135</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE resumed, by expressing his thankfulness for being called back to his subject. He was just going to say, that eighteen years ago, the people of Lower Canada complained very loudly that they were emptying their chests for the benefit of the Upper Province. That amount was trifling, and it grieved them sorely to disburse it. But last Session the people of Upper Canada had been compelled to vote not less a sum than \$1,825,000<sup>136</sup> [OR] \$1,800,000 ... to pay the seigniors of Lower Canada. Every one, almost, supported the first bill, which gave the seigniors and their lawyers no such sums of public money; but that did not suit these gentry, and so it was withdrawn.<sup>137</sup> The House was now asked to say that the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure was an equitable adjustment. He considered that as regarded Upper Canada, it was far from being an equitable adjustment.<sup>138</sup> They had to express their sanction of that act of spoliation. He for one would never sanction that act. It was, perhaps, the very worst they had ever been called on to sanction<sup>139</sup>.

Hear, hear, from the Opposition.<sup>140</sup>

[MR. MACKENZIE] thought a precious quantity of this money would go into the pockets of the gentlemen of the long robe. (Laughter.) And, by and by, they would be called on for more. It would be all very well, perhaps, if they could give it, but it was not improbable they would be unable to do so. If there were a tightness in the money market, it would be confoundedly hard for the gentlemen below to get all the money they wanted. (Laughter.) Why, he would ask, could they not take this money out of the Jesuits' estate[s]? (Hear, hear.)<sup>141</sup> But he believed they had not yet seen the bottom of the bag, and more money, more blood, would be wrung out of Upper Canada. (Hear, hear.)<sup>142</sup> How was this matter finally settled. Was it in accordance with the wishes of the people of Upper Canada? Not it. But so far from such a settlement being come to, the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church were pleased to tell us that we must not settle it as the people of Upper Canada wished--the inhabitants of this Province, although having such a great interest at stake, were not to be consulted at all--but the people of Lower Canada were to decide on it as they thought proper. Had it been left to the people of Upper Canada, the money would have been applied to the purposes of education. That would have been a noble appropriation; for by education alone could the rising generation be imbued with generous and noble sentiments--by education alone could they be so trained, that their mature years would find them intelligent and prosperous. The hon. gentleman was proceeding upon a history of a large collection of books--a very learned clerk, who could speak both languages, and enjoyed a very large salary, when<sup>143</sup>--

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ... called [him] to order ... amid loud cries of chair, chair.<sup>144</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said he would not on any account proceed against the decision (sic) of the Speaker, who generally was so very kind to him in often allowing him to go wrong, so he must defer informing the house how much money this learned clerk got. But how did we settle this question of the Clergy Reserves? Why, the eight Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church told us we were not to settle them in the way the people of Upper Canada desired us, but what business had they to tell us how we were to settle them? We have been reminded that in order to benefit ourselves, it would be advisable that we joined the other Colonies, if we did join them, should we have to be constantly paying out our money. His own opinion was,<sup>145</sup> the sooner we are rid of Lower Canada, and Lower Canada is rid of us, the better for both.<sup>146</sup> He had no ill feeling against them, on the contrary, he found them a good set of fellows when they were in Quebec, and he would advise that they should stop down there altogether.<sup>147</sup> He admired the way in which the French Canadians had stood together for the advantage of their country, but as soon as the worst of them and the worst of the Upper Canadians were joined together in the Government, the Province was made to suffer. (Hear, hear.)<sup>148</sup> The hon. gentleman here spoke of the connection of Mr. Elled with the County of Beauharnois, and the manner in which his interests were looked after, as was the case both by Mr. Hincks and others,--contended at some length, that if the honorable gentlemen opposite kept their seats, the country would have a large amount to pay, of which Upper Canada would have the greater proportion. He would further read a severance of the union with Lower Canada, when taking into consideration the present position of the mother country as connected with the European States, as also with our neighbors over (sic) the line. Altogether, the subject was one for deep reflection and the sooner we gave it our fixed and steady attention (sic) the better; and it would be advisable that we should at once petition the House of Commons upon the subject. In going, with a friend, into the Legislative Council early this afternoon, he (Mr. Mackenzie) found that they had already concluded their labors, and one of them remarked that if the

members of this House would make short speeches they would finish their day's business much sooner than they did at present. Before the closing of this debate it was his intention of offering a few more remarks in reference to the measure for representation by population<sup>149</sup>, [as] he intended to move the question<sup>150</sup>. A measure highly desirable, as in Lower Canada the population was 450,000 less than in Upper Canada, at the same time they have an equal share in the representation, and on the score of taxation they only contributed one dollar to our three. (Hear, hear.) Yet we have millions upon millions of dollars of our money spent below; yet when the Czar, Mr. Lafontaine was asked to meet half way in the fixing of a place for the Legislature, he would not consent to the proposal--he would have no half-way house between Upper and Lower Canada--down to Quebec he would go. We must raise the money and they must spend it--such was the fashion.<sup>151</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>152</sup> At the present rate the Province was proceeding at, we were placing bonds in the hands of the brokers in England which, in a very few years may be made available upon the estate of every yeoman in the Province, and the men holding these bonds had the power just at the moment of our difficulties if it suited their purpose.<sup>153</sup>

MR. FELTON attacked Mr. MacKenzie for the abuse of hon. members on his (Mr. F.'s) side of the House. He apprehended there was no man in this House or out of it who would be at all damaged by any amount of villification (sic) or abuse from such a source.<sup>154</sup> As a set off to the statement of the member for Haldimand against the member for Laprairie (Mr. Loranger) he might mention that only a few weeks ago he had a conversation with several of (sic) the Judges of the Superior Court, and every one of them without exception spoke in the highest terms of the professional abilities and attainments of the member for Laprairie.<sup>155</sup> The Chief Justice Sir L.H. Lafontaine had paid him, Mr. Loranger, the highest encomiums and stated that, without exception among the counsel employed, he had treated the question most successfully and clearly. When the source from whence this compliment came, and the fact that the partner of the hon. and learned member for Montreal, Mr. Cherrier, was one of the counsel referred to, the House would be able to judge whether the Government had committed to weak and incompetent hands such momentous interests.<sup>156</sup> It is well for men who could not speak the truth even if they tried, to cast aspersions upon his hon. friend for Laprairie. He is above suspicion. He stands high as a lawyer. It would have been culpable in the Government in not giving to that hon. gentleman the position of counsel for the Crown before the Seigniorial Court.<sup>157</sup> He [Mr. F.] said it was not generally known the labor and qualifications that are required to deal with the Seigniorial Tenure, and stated that the treatment proposed by the hon. member for Montreal savored more of the lawyer of the past than of the present century. He then adverted to the fact that the Opposition had not as yet agreed upon their line of conduct regarding the Seigniorial Tenure.<sup>158</sup> The hon. member for Montreal says this is a trifling subject, and treats it as a matter which can be very easily disposed of. Other hon. members of the Opposition say it is a grave question and can never be settled. They cannot agree among themselves. This is an important question, the question. The Clergy Reserves question is an Upper Canada question and occupies the same position here as the Seigniorial Tenure question does in Lower Canada. The gentlemen in opposition are not agreed among themselves as to the settlement of this question.<sup>159</sup> He dwelt at some length on the importance of the question to Lower Canada, remarking that the Tenure had been an obstacle to the settlement, in seigniories, of people of Anglo-Saxon origin. By its abolition, the French Canadians had shown they were willing to open up the country to other nationalities than their own.<sup>160</sup> He would not have referred to the subject at all, but to show the good faith with which Ministers had acted in this important measure. As a proof of the difficulty of the Seigniorial Bill, he would mention the fact that six judges

at Quebec--men of the highest talent--had failed to decide as yet upon this question. He congratulated the Ministry on the progress that they made in pushing the Seigniorial Tenure and the Clergy Reserves through, notwithstanding the opposition that they had met with.<sup>161</sup> Mr. Felton then referred to the support given by him and others to the Government--spoke of the prophecy made by the Opposition as to the non-fulfilment of the promises made last session by the Ministry, and showed that they turned out incorrect--the Ministry having carried through to his satisfaction the various important questions which they had proposed to the House. The honorable gentlemen (sic) next referred to the Municipal Act of Lower Canada which he said was an excellent one, notwithstanding the Opposition of certain members from Lower Canada.<sup>162</sup> It had received the almost universal approbation of the people of that part of the Province. Members who had opposed the Bill while here, had now been informed by their constituents, that they heartily approve of the Act as the best one they ever had. People had been too much in the habit, in Lower Canada, to look to great towns as lights to lead them in every thing. Nothing could now be done that did not originate there. It was this bill which would more than anything else break down the system of centralization which had cursed Lower Canada.<sup>163</sup> [It would] make the people among whom it worked take their place among the nations of the earth, and he trusted that the day was not far distant when this Province would be prepared to take her place among those nations, and be prepared to govern herself.<sup>164</sup> It was necessary to be prepared for such a change by having good municipal acts.<sup>165</sup> It was the training in this municipal system which placed the people of the United States, when they threw off their allegiance to Great Britain, in a position to carry on self-government so successfully.<sup>166</sup> Mr. Felton next turned to the separate School Act, which he said was the same in Upper and Lower Canada, except that in Upper Canada there is a Roman Catholic minority, and in Lower Canada there is a Protestant minority. The hon. member for Lambton thinks that the Separate School Bill will destroy the whole Common School Act. If the hon. member should succeed in destroying the Separate School Law will not the Roman Catholic majority in Lower Canada demand a similar thing in Lower Canada, and say to the Protestants that they shall not have separate schools either.<sup>167</sup> He was prepared to hear the hon. member for Lambton put forward a great many specious arguments against Separate Schools; because his object was to have Protestant supremacy in Upper Canada, and he (Mr. Brown) calculated that in three generations hence there would be no Roman Catholic Schools in Upper Canada. The hon. member for Lambton would get up by and by and make a very specious speech, and no doubt to-morrow the Globe would come out with every word of it; while he (Mr. Felton,) would be cut off with a few lines.<sup>168</sup> As a Protestant he might feel with the honorable member, but he was constrained from acting with him by two considerations. He felt that any persecution of this sort among Roman Catholics here would be retaliated on the Protestants in Lower Canada. He felt, too, it would be a cruel injustice to deprive parents of the right to educate their children in a manner which they thought would best promote their interests here, and be conducive to their salvation in the world to come.<sup>169</sup> He did not wish to thrust down the throats of others what they do not wish. The hon. gentleman for Lambton would oblige other gentlemen--even the whole Protestant population of Lower Canada--to submit to Roman Catholics, and to send their children to the Roman Catholic Schools. The hon. member for Lambton says that men must not educate their children as they think fit, but adopt the Spartan system, and send them all to one public institution.<sup>170</sup> But nothing would suit the hon. member but that all should be educated to be as immaculate Patriots as himself; if he had his way, he would introduce, under the name of broad Protestant principles, a system in which the saints, after the fashion of the hon. member, should rule, and all should be free to act just as the hon. member and his friends should tell them. That was his

(Mr. Brown's) idea of Protestant liberality; he (Mr. Felton) had a very different notion of it.<sup>171</sup> If these views were adopted, we should have a civil war of races and a separation between Upper and Lower Canada. He (Mr. Felton) would not object to this separation, if justice be not done to Lower Canada. But there is no fear of this. The majority of Upper Canada members are prepared to be reasonable and to make allowances for differences in religious views and in differences of race. The hon. gentleman again eulogized the coalition ministry, and pledged to them his support.<sup>172</sup>

MR. POULIOT, alluding to the speech of the hon. member for L'Assomption (Papin) said, that as a notary he was engaged to make cadastres not by the Ministry, but by the Commissioners. If he had been employed by the Government, he would have resigned his seat.<sup>173</sup> But ... he did not suppose that his position in the House prevented him from being employed professionally as a notary<sup>174</sup>. He acted as a professional man in taking censuses in order to make cadastres. He was as independent now as he was last Session. On some questions last session, he differed from the Ministry, therefore, he was independent, and held the confidence of his constituency. The hon. member for Haldimand spoke of \$6 a day given to Members. This is his favourite idea. (Order.) He said he had accepted the indemnity. (Order.) He turned to the hon. member for Lambton, and said that he had been for it also. (Order.)<sup>175</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER le rappela à l'ordre en lui disant de limiter ses remarques à l'amendement devant la chambre.<sup>176</sup>

MR. TURCOTTE here said, that the name of the hon. member for Lambton had been named 372 times in the course of the debate<sup>177</sup> and he believed that quite enough.<sup>178</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND--said, I cannot allow this debate to close without saying a few words. I will endeavor not to make one allusion to the hon. member for Lambton, for if that honorable member has been named already in this debate 372 times, as stated by the hon. member for Maskinonge (Mr. Turcotte) I think that is often enough for the present. I shall abstain from all recrim[i]nation in the few remarks I have to make.--There has been a great deal of recrimination thrown out against the Ministry, although not much against myself personally. Yet this much I have been charged with, that I have kept back from the country all knowledge of how that important business was progressing with which I, more than my colleagues, was entrusted. I should be sorry to think that the Opposition should have been deprived of any knowledge which the gentlemen on this side of the House were entrusted with in regard to the public business of the country; for I deem it my duty to make all the members of the other side of the House as fully acquainted with everything I do in connection with public affairs, as I am myself. I feel that although we may be supported by a party, we do not govern for the interests of that party, we govern for the whole country, and it never was my intention to keep anything secret in reference to the Seigniorial Tenure question. It was a difficult law to carry into operation, owing to the immense number of details to be dealt with; but having been chosen as an humble instrument to carry out the law referred to, I took good care to throw open to the public all the proceedings connected with our operations. I would not indeed have been surprised to hear hon. gentlemen from the country rise up in their places, and say that the whole proceedings were veiled in mystery; but I was surprised that hon. gentlemen from Quebec and Montreal<sup>179</sup> [OR] that the member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion) and the member for L'Assomption, (Mr. Papin,)<sup>180</sup> should say they had no opportunity of knowing what was done. The offices of the commissioners

at Montreal and Quebec were open to the public, and the commissioners were recommended to invite members of Parliament and the public generally to go to these offices and see what they were doing on this important work. I now call upon hon. gentlemen to go to these offices and see the shelves laden with the labours of these gentlemen thus employed in them; and if any hon. gentleman goes there, he will see that although they have been charged with doing nothing, there has been more administrative business done during this recess, than there ever was before, during any previous recess. (Hear, hear.) I deem it my duty, after what has transpired, to enter into some details in regard to the manner in which this administrative business has been proceeded with, in order as much as possible to save for the censitaires that sacred fund which had been voted for their relief, and to bring to the speediest possible close this important work which was to change the tenure of Lower Canada, from a feudal tenure to a free tenure. I did not want (sic) till the close of the session before commencing operations; but I obtained access to a number of the books of the Seigniors, in order to examine them, deeming it prudent to adopt no plan, till I had fully investigated the matter. Although I had much experience personally with the working of the feudal system I did not trust myself to that experience but wished (sic) to go over some of these books again to assure myself of the exact state of affairs. I met in Montreal with a number of persons, men of education and reflection, and who take an interest in the affairs of the country who furnished me with very valuable information in reference to the books of the Seigniors. I therefore came to the conclusion that the best course to pursue was to send one commissioner to a Seigniorship where the books were in perfect order, that a second should be sent to a Seigniorship where the books were in less perfect order, and a third to a Seigniorship where there were no books at all. By this means I was enabled to ascertain what amount of time would be required to complete the work. In order now to enable gentlemen to understand the amount of labor that must have been undergone, I will describe briefly the sort of schedule which was required by the Act. These schedules required to contain the number of every farm, woodland, village and farm-lot in every Seigniorship in Lower Canada. One column indicates the number found on the Seignior[y]; plan if there be any; another the number for future reference and for registration or other purpose, a third the frontage, breadth and superficial extent of each lot; a fourth the rent charge; a fifth all other annual charges; a sixth the amount of additional charges arising out of casual rights--such as lods et ventes. The filling up of these columns was merely a work of manual labor, requiring nothing more than accuracy in copying from the books of the Seigniors wherever they were found in good order. Two of these columns, which cannot be filled up until the Special Court has decided upon the important questions submitted for their consideration, will show the proportion chargeable on each lot, for the right of banalité and for the exclusive right to hold water power and build mills,--if such rights be admitted,--or to the extent to which they may be sanctioned by the Court. The remaining columns will show--1st, the full amount of the charges as established by the commissioners. 2nd, the proportion paid or payable to the seigniors out of the fund appropriated for the relief of the censitaires; and 3rdly, the balance payable by the censitaire as a rent charge redeemable at his convenience. Add to this the fact, that those schedules must be accompanied by a detailed statement not only of all the mutation fines accrued during ten years on each Seigniorship, but also the basis upon which the right of banalité and other rights acknowledged by the Court, shall have been calculated, and some idea may be formed of the extent of the labor which the commissioners have been called upon to perform. The first thing of importance was to have a good form made out, and before the forms were printed this was made as perfect as possible, and so great was the care bestowed on this form, that, notwithstanding the number of men employed on the work, not

one of them had been able to suggest a single improvement on these schedules.<sup>181</sup> Each of these schedules occupies a sheet of paper  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet by 3 feet square<sup>182</sup> [OR]  $4\frac{1}{2}$  by 5 feet square<sup>183</sup> [OR] four or five feet square<sup>184</sup>. If I had proposed to name a commissioner for each Seignior, I believe, with the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion), that the cost would have swallowed up a large part of the sum voted. Or if I had been desirous of securing political importance and support, and had been desirous of sacrificing the interests of the country,--in order to obtain that, I would have adopted a course entirely different from that which I had pursued. Instead of that, I suggested to the Commissioners to select a young man of intelligence and an expert writer, and set him down to one of these sheets for ten hours a day, in order to ascertain what amount of time would be required to fill these sheets from the Seigniors' books<sup>185</sup>, not including the valuations<sup>186</sup>, as two-thirds of them, at least, brought their books up within the last seven or eight years. We set down a young gentleman, who wielded a ready pen, to fill up these sheets; and, upon the calculations made, we came to the conclusion that 12s. 6d. would be sufficient remuneration (sic) for filling each of these sheets. After this calculation, we sent for some of the leading men in the various Seigniories, the best and most intelligent of them, and we appealed to their desire to see this question settled, and to take upon themselves the labor of filling up these columns. Many of the leading notaries came forward for the sake of assisting in this great work, and they undertook to see that these schedules would be filled up. The same thing was done in Quebec, and at Three Rivers, and the consequence is that, at the present moment these schedules for every Seignior in the Province are filled up with all the work that could be done before the decision of the judges was given. I do think that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Daoust), when he complained of these schedules not being completed, had forgotten that part of the law which states that the schedules must not be filled up until the decision of the judges. The law forbids their completion until the decision has been pronounced by the judges upon the question submitted to them. While this work was going on during last Session, the Commissioners suggested some amendments to the act. The law was amended, and these amendments I am happy to say, have been productive of very important results. We saw in making up the schedules the most difficult thing would be to make up the average for ten years of the lods et ventes, but by altering the law, and by making it necessary only to fix an approximate sum, I knew that the Seigniors would come forward and give us these lists which nobody could give correctly but them, and by this means I believe we have saved at least 5,000L to the country. These lists are made by the Seigniors themselves, and I am happy to say that four-fifths of them are now in the hands<sup>187</sup> of the Commissioners. The hon. member for Beauharnois, has stated<sup>188</sup> that the Government are compelled to pay the Seigniors upon the 1st of January, 1856, but that hon. gentleman has misinterpreted the law. The law is not such as stated by him, but provides that if the lists were not completed, the government shall then proceed to make an estimate of the amount to be paid. The hon. gentleman also knows that all the statements must be before the Commissioners before they can make up ... these approximate estimates. Yet the hon. member for Beauharnois says the Government are bound to pay the Seigniors on the 1st of January. The law is as I have quoted. The law, it is true, says the first payment must be made on the 1st January or the 1st July; but the Government is not bound to make the first payment until the 1st July, 1856.<sup>189</sup> If the Seigniors had suffered any thing from a delay in receiving the indemnity for lods et ventes which they had ceased to receive, it was because some of their own body had not made up their approximate statements, since the money was to be distributed equally in proportion to the total of each.<sup>190</sup> I ask any gentleman in this House, if he doubts what I say, to look at the law and say whether we were really bound to proceed to make this

approximate statement until the 1st January. But we were anxious to meet the Seigniors fairly. We were anxious to do them justice, and if they have not received justice before now, it is not as insinuated in consequence of the absence of a fund to meet their claims. The hon. member for Beauharnois asks if there is a fund, and, if so, what it is to consist of. That hon. gentleman knows very well there are funds accruing from shop licenses and the various sources mentioned in the law. I may here state that although the law does not compel the Government to make the first payment until the 1st of July, yet it is not the intention of the Government to delay the payment until that time; but as soon as these approximate estimates are made the Seigniors will be paid the sum due to them; and afterwards, on the 1st of July, another payment will be made. I am happy to inform this House that the amount of lods et ventes to be paid to the Seigniors does not exceed the sum of 25,000L annually, and it is supposed that the whole sum to be claimed by them will not exceed 30,000L annually; and it is most satisfactory to know that the Commissioners are prepared to meet at any moment the decision which shall be given by the Special Court, and so soon as their decision is pronounced the commissioners will proceed to close the matter up. If all the reservations be declared to be null--if the exclusive privileges of the Seigniors be swept away by the Court, then nothing more will remain to be valued but the right of banaylite (sic) and the lods et ventes, so that it will be seen that by the mode adopted by Government a large amount of money has been saved to the Province, and an immense amount of unnecessary labor will be spared to the Commissioners. I must say that I have no recollection of having stated any sum which would be required to carry out the law. But when hon. gentleman (sic) opposite stated that the cost of executing the law would exceed 50,000L or as some of them said 100,000L, I stated that I did not think it would require more than the half of that amount. Then, as to the remark of the hon. member for Beauharnois that the court has already cost 10,000L, I think I am correct in saying, that the full amount issued by the Commissioners for all the labor done does not amount to that figure. I believe it does not exceed 8,000L, and I am certain that it does not amount to 10,000L. And in taking into consideration the immense amount of information to be laid before the count[r]y it is a matter of congratulation as well as astonishment that the expense has not been much greater. With regard to the alleged delay connected with the decision I must say that no time was lost in bringing this question before the judges. At the earnest request of the judges themselves,<sup>191</sup> who did not wish to proceed to so important a matter, with jaded minds,<sup>192</sup> the consideration of the question was delayed until the 5th of Sept., and the interval was not lost for the counsel employed to argue the question were enabled to dip deeply into every source of knowledge connected with the question which had already been open, and the dark archives of our country as well as the archives of France were searched for information on this question, in the few short months that elapsed before counsel were called upon to argue this question. Every member of the bar who knows this question, was disposed to say that no time had been lost in bringing it forward, and I believe every one connected with it, admitted that the case was most ably argued by the counsel employed by the Crown.--And in spite of the sneers and jests of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will say that the hon. member for Laprairie, by the able manner in which he argued this question, placed himself ta (sic) the very head of his profession, and he can afford to laugh to scorn the ribald jests that are made against him. It is only a proof that he has raised himself in the estimation of his countrymen, when these darts are launched at him, which are sure to be launched at every man of talent--at every man whose brow is encircled with a halo of renown. The honorable gentleman discussed the question in such a manner as to attract the attention of every member of the bar. The question took something like a month to discuss, and the honorable gentleman occupied

in that time 12 days in succession in discussing a subject to which he had devoted his time during the course of a whole year. The honorable Attorney General here, alluded to the questions which were brought before the court, and spoke of the good which would result from their labors. The law that these judges would lay down would not only settle one dispute, but it would be applicable to one hundred thousand such cases.<sup>193</sup> The cadastres would be useful, not only for the purposes of the Seigniorial Tenure Law, but for the purposes of registration. Hereafter, every lot of land in the country would be numbered, and the lots might be traced instead of, as at present, only the owners. A new and complete registration would be possible, which had hitherto been out of the question.<sup>194</sup> It would also enable them to make a complete map of Lower Canada. For in order to fill up the schedules, it was necessary that the limits of each Seigniorie should be ascertained, and having now obtained a map of all the Seigniories, a person has been employed to copy these, and a correct map of Lower Canada is already in progress, and ere long Government will feel bound to come down before you, to ask assistance to complete this great undertaking. I trust I have said enough on this subject to convince the House, that we have not been idle in regard to this great work. (Go on, go on.) I cannot proceed further without answering the implied accusation against the Government, for not having given information upon this question before. I would ask, what is the proper time for Government to give information<sup>195</sup> on their administrative proceedings during the recess<sup>196</sup>, if it is not when the House meets. If any reference has been made to this or any other subject in their address, hon. gentlemen might have understood that the Government was prepared to give full explanations upon all those matters. (Hear, hear.) Surely they are not to be reproached beforehand for not giving information, when their (sic) was no means of conveying that information to hon. members. It is not usual to send down reports and returns to hon. gentlemen during the recess of Parliament, to let them know what the administration are doing.<sup>197</sup> Ministers were now ready to give every information that was necessary, and would give more shortly when various motions came up for returns on the subject.<sup>198</sup> I am satisfied that we shall be prepared not only to show the amount of labour performed, but the amount of money expended on this question; and I may add in reference to the economy which has been pursued in it, that if hon. gentlemen will call upon those persons who have been employed on this work, and ask if they are satisfied with their payment, I believe they will receive for answer that both the commissioners and myself are very stingy fellows. (Hear, hear.) The principal expense will be the printing of the reports, but I believe the country will be greatly benefitted by the reports which will be brought out, much advantage will be derived from them in France, and in every place where the feudal system has existed. Another matter of administrative concern is the carrying out of the Municipal Law. I can assure (sic) the House that had not constant attention been paid to this bill to provide the people with the means of making themselves thoroughly informed upon its provisions. Had not the printers been urged on day and night until copies of the Bill had been distributed throughout the country, I can assure you gentlemen that that Bill passed at a late period of last session--how that Bill passed in the month of May would not have been carried into operation in the month of July. Since that time a very large proportion of the time of the Hon. Mr. Provincial Secretary, and of myself has been taken up in guiding and directing these people who seem to be anxious to carry out the law in the course they should pursue. I found it my duty to depart from the rule laid down for the guidance of ministers of the crown, as to giving municipal officers advice for which they may hold the law officers of the crown responsible and which may in some cases bring the law officers of the crown in direct contact with the judges of ... the country. I thought proper to depart from this rule and to advise all who thought proper to enquire of me how to carry out the

system. At present the law has been carried out. Where officers were not appointed by the people they were appointed by the Government. Now, however, that the system is freely in operation, I will not again run the risk of coming into contact with the officers of justice by any advice which I might give. I have some opportunity of knowing how the law is carried out--and what the feeling of the country is, and I can state as remarked by the hon. member for Wolfe (Mr. Felton) that its success has far exceeded my hopes. It has raised among our people a spirit of rivalry and a desire for progress which I thought it would take years to superinduce. This much, I will say, to the credit of these much libeled, much maligned people, the French Canadians, that out of seven applications under the Municipal Loan Fund for funds to make roads and build bridges, five of these were made by municipalities, composed almost exclusively of French Canadians. All this required time to carry out and it is quite certain that if the Government had been idling their time, as hon. gentlemen seem to imagine, these results would not have been produced. An accusation has been brought against the Government, because some of their number were absent in England. I believe I may say that some of these gentlemen were rendering as important service to the country while there, as their colleagues whom they left behind. There was one important matter to attend to--the transfer of the ordnance lands to this country. It was necessary that the transfer of this property, worth some millions of pounds, should have been settled at once.<sup>199</sup> The Inspector General had been making important financial arrangements.<sup>200</sup> I believe the Inspector General's time was not lost. It was necessary that the credit of the country should be maintained, and that further information should be given of the state of our finances, the results of which the Inspector General will show at the proper time, and also how he spent his time in that matter. The Hon. Receiver General succeeded also in procuring for the service of the volunteer force a supply of the very best arms that could be obtained (hear, hear.) The only effect of their absence was to throw upon their colleagues here an additional amount of labour, and from that labor they did not shrink. I think for five weeks before we left Quebec we sat every day from 11 o'clock till 5 or 6 o'clock in Council, and scarcely lost a single day in all that time, so anxious were we to expedite all the business before the government was transferred. Honorable gentlemen must not forget one important thing, that in consequence of the adoption of this rotatory system, nearly three months were lost, because we were unable to follow up our work with that assiduity necessary. I trust hon. gentlemen will bear this fact in mind when the propriety of a change in this system comes to be discussed.<sup>201</sup> He hoped that the system would soon be brought to an end, and would be prepared to state his views fully on it, when the question came up distinctly, although not as a government question.<sup>202</sup> I shall not detain the House any longer. I always feel reluctant to take up the time of the House, especially after so long a debate. I trust we shall have got rid of all our animosities, and that we shall be enabled to proceed to business.<sup>203</sup>

MR. PAPIN demanda alors à M. Drummond, qui prenait son siège, s'il ne donnerait pas à la chambre quelque explication sur les réformes judiciaires qu'il se proposait d'introduire dans cette session.<sup>204</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND excused himself for not taking up the question of a Reform in the judicature, by the pressure of the other important business of which he had spoken.<sup>205</sup> I have always stated that I considered that no judicial change should be attempted in the country until we had obtained a good municipal system in Lower Canada. I considered that was the basis of all decentralization. I desired first to promote the decentralization of our municipalities. I felt that we could no longer build our Court Houses with money taken from the Consolidated Fund. I felt

that the people of Lower Canada should be made to know that they must build their Court Houses<sup>206</sup> and Gaols<sup>207</sup> and maintain and repair them in the same way as the people of Upper Canada. I wished, as far as possible, to put both sections of the country upon a just and equitable footing. I wish to take away all cause of dissension and jealousy. This municipal system has now gone into operation, and the time certainly has come when we may introduce a new system of judicature. But I think it cannot be carried into effect unless accompanied by a good code of procedure. The labor, and meditation and thought required for the preparation of these two great measures was such that I certainly was unable to overtake them during this recess, because having been more particularly (*sic*) engaged in carrying out the measure with which I had been charged, I felt it my duty to devote my time to it in order to carry it out in such a manner as would deserve the approval of my colleagues.<sup>208</sup> He meant, however, to take the first opportunity of going to New Orleans to study the manner in which the civil law was put in practice in the only State in this continent, except Canada, where that law prevailed. This was especially necessary with regard to the rules respecting the making of proof.<sup>209</sup> It was the intention of the government to come down during this session and provide for the sub-division of the court districts in Lower Canada<sup>210</sup> and the building of Court Houses in these districts, and I trust that such sub-divisions will be made or will meet the approval of this House. It is most desirable that this last change in our judicial system shall not be like all the rest, lasting only for a few years; but that it will be such as we may be proud of, such as will meet the wants of the people, and if so they will not regret that one year more will be passed in the study and preparation of this important measure. I believe that time respects only what time produces. In matters of secondary importance time is less a question of moment.<sup>211</sup> [OR] In matters of great moment, time was a question of secondary importance. First, they should build their Court-houses; and time should be allowed for bringing in a good judiciary system, and a good code of procedure.<sup>212</sup> I have been told that I have promised this and I have promised that; but I must have the concurrence of my colleagues and also of this Legislature in any measure that I might wish brought in. I shall be ever ready to render all the assistance in my power to establish such a judicial system as shall be a credit to the country. But before we have a good judicial code we must first have a revision of the Statutory Laws. So soon as this is accomplished, if I still have the honor of occupying a seat in the House, whether on this side or on that, I shall strain every nerve to introduce a bill to obtain a code for Canada. The hon. gentleman sat down amidst the applause of the House.<sup>213</sup>

La division fut alors prise sur l'amendement de M. Daoust<sup>214</sup>.

(51)

*And the fourth paragraph being again read, as followeth:--That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises in like manner to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made.*

*Mr. Charles Daoust moved in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. Wilson, That all the words after "That" to the end thereof be left out, and the words "this House regards with concern the delay in the proceedings adopted by virtue of the Laws passed during the last Session, relative to the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure, and the heavy expenses thereby accruing; and entertains serious doubts as to the*

ultimate results of that Legislation in closing a long but just and necessary agitation," inserted instead thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

(51-52)

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Lumsden, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Matheson, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, and Young.--(37.)

(52)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, DeLong, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Niles, O'Farrell, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Roblin, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(69.)

So it passed in the Negative.

The Question being then put on the fourth paragraph; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

YEAS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, DeLong, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, McCann, Masson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Niles, O'Farrell, Patrick, Poulin, Pouliot, Powell, Price, Rankin, Rhodes, Roblin, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(69.)

(52-53)

NAYS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Lumsden, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Matheson, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, and Young.--(37.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.215

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER having read the clause of the Address relating to the Legislative Council,216

MR. MACKENZIE moved in amendment, that the following words be added--"and will endeavour to provide that the several Electoral Districts, into which this Province will be divided, shall under a census to be taken at an early day, with a view to the election of the members of the said Legislative Council and of the Legislative Assembly, be arranged as nearly as may be on the principle of Representation by population, and without regard to any dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada."<sup>217</sup> The hon. gent. spoke at much length in favor of representation (sic) by population.<sup>218</sup> If we were to continue a united province, the hon. member said, it must be on the basis of Representation by population. On what other basis could representation be reasonably placed? Would any one say that taxation should be the basis, when he affirmed that any committee that might be appointed by the House, and that would candidly enquire into the matter, would find that we of Upper Canada paid three dollars of taxation for every one paid by Lower Canada. And if that were so, Upper Canada should have three members for one from Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) But he was willing that whether a county was rich or poor, whether a new county, or wealthy and populous like that surrounding Toronto, population should be the basis. But if it was to be insisted that Lower Canada, though inferior in population, should have 65 votes for Upper Canada's 65, although the one province was rapidly doubling, while the other was getting on very slowly, then a dissolution of the Union must be the result.<sup>219</sup> They were asked to foot all the bills contracted by their Lower Canadian neighbors, and yet were denied representation by population. The French ingredient in their representation was he contended, the vinegar which destroyed the wine. He did not believe that Canada would have suffered half its losses were it not for Lower Canada.<sup>220</sup> And now was the time for bringing forward the question. If there was to be a general election directly, he wished the people of Upper Canada to understand what was the feeling of the Lower Canada representatives towards them. In 1841 did not every leading man in Lower Canada cry out for Representation by Population?<sup>221</sup>

Cries of No! No! from MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER and other French members.<sup>222</sup>

[MR. MACKENZIE:] Oh! The Provincial Secretary wanted Canada to be annexed to the States at that time.<sup>223</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--No!<sup>224</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said that his worthy friend from Soulanges (Dr. Masson) who was, like himself, among the emigrants at that time--(laughter)--also made a cry about it. The Hon. John Neilson did, and he was sure Mr. Morin did, and Mr. Lafontaine.<sup>225</sup>

No! No!<sup>226</sup>

[MR. MACKENZIE:] Hon. gentlemen were extremely anxious to say, No! when he was asking them no questions. (Laughter.) The sooner they got this matter settled the better. Would any one tell him that the people of Lower Canada would be content that this should be the permanent Seat of Government? Would any man rise and say so? (No! No!) Well, then, would they of Upper Canada be content to go back again to the cold miserable latitude of Quebec? (Laughter.) This moving, oscillating Parliament, he verily believed, had moved about during the last 15 or 16 years, over a considerably larger extent of ground, than the Israelites travelled under Moses in 40 years. (Hear, hear.)<sup>227</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER stated that the hon. member was not speaking to the question.<sup>228</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said the amendments related to Representation by Population, and his argument was that if this were not granted, and if<sup>229</sup> the people in the Upper Province were not contented that the Seat of Government should be fixed at Quebec, or Montreal; the people of the Lower Province would not be satisfied if it were fixed in Toronto--the Provinces ought to be separated. What bond of union, he would ask, have we with Lower Canada? Is not our language different, and are not our laws different? The sole bond of union between both provinces were, the St. Lawrence and the national debt, which latter hung round their necks. The hon. gentleman then went into a long detail of the consequences of an unequal representation--contending that everything showed that representation by population was a measure imperatively necessary for the country.<sup>230</sup> [He spoke] of the grant for seed-grain, the Baby contracts, the grants to ecclesiastical institutions, and many other matters brought about by French majorities, as arguments either for Representation by Population, or failing that, a Dissolution of the Union<sup>231</sup>--

Rapping of the desks of the Lower Canada members [while the gentleman spoke.]<sup>232</sup>

[MR. MACKENZIE continued:] If Upper Canada had had her fair vote, she would never have been saddled with a tax of \$1,800,000 to relieve the lease-holders in Lower Canada. If Representation by Population could not be carried, then the people of Upper Canada would go for the system of allowing legislation for the one Province to be carried on at Quebec, and for the other at Toronto. The hon. member proceeded to speak on a variety of other topics, bearing on the connection between Upper and Lower Canada--<sup>233</sup>

Frequent interruptions [while the gentleman spoke] by kicking of the desks on the part of some of the members, a manifestation which was checked by MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.<sup>234</sup>

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria) objected to the amendment being put, on a question of order, as the name of another branch of the Legislature than that referred to in the resolution, was introduced.<sup>235</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ruled the amendment to be in order.<sup>236</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY in reply to the member for Haldimand, rose to protest against his practise of taking up the time of the House with long, rambling and pointed speeches. That hon. gentleman's speech that evening had, as usual, been full of mis-statements;<sup>237</sup> the hon. gentleman had risen at a very late hour, and gone into a variety of statements at a very inconvenient time to reply to a course, which was the reason why many of such statements went forth to the world uncontradicted.<sup>238</sup> He (hon. Mr. C.), had offered to correct the hon. gentleman, but would not be listened to. That hon. gentleman still went on enunciating mis-statement after mis-statement, until the whole matter became involved in such confusion that it became utterly impossible to ascertain what the hon. gentleman wanted. He (Hon. Mr. C.) wanted but an opportunity to refute all these mis-statements. He wanted to show, with reference to the Montreal Court House that the money with which it was raised, was paid out of the suitor's fees, he wanted to show that the loans to the Grand Trunk Railroad Company, were loans raised on the responsibility of the parties

borrowing the money--he wanted to show that the roads and bridges mentioned by that hon. gentleman, were not unnecessary, and that the money spent in their construction had not been extravagantly expended,--and he also wanted to show, in answer to the member for Lambton, on a previous occasion, that the expenditure in Upper Canada amounted to 500,000L, which in Lower Canada it was but 300,000L.<sup>239</sup>

MR. CHAPPAIS also made some explanations in reference to an allusion by Mr. Mackenzie to the voting at the last election in Mr. Chapais' constituency, where there were more votes recorded than the number of the entire population.<sup>240</sup>

MR. AIKINS wished to offer a few brief remarks upon the amendment of the hon. member for Haldimand, and which he had great pleasure in seconding.<sup>241</sup> He said the hon. Inspector General had accused the member for Haldimand of making mis-statements, and that he was desirous of pointing them out. He was quite surprised, then, when the Inspector General sat down without having done so. He had pleasure in seconding the amendment of the hon. member for Haldimand, because he believed the principle it embodied was a correct one, and if correct it ought to be endorsed by the House. From the course the Government had taken in voting down all the amendments offered by the Opposition, he presumed the Elective Council Bill, which was rejected last session, was that which was again to be introduced. And if that was the case, he considered it absolutely necessary that the principles of Representation by Population should be brought into operation before the election of an Upper House for the term of<sup>242</sup> 8 years<sup>243</sup>, by the expiry of which period, he believed the population of Upper Canada would be at least double that of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) Even at present the preponderance of the population of Upper Canada over that of Lower Canada was some 250,000 or 300,000.<sup>244</sup>

Cries of No! "What right have you to say so?"<sup>245</sup>

MR. AIKINS said he was warranted in making that statement by looking at the progress which Upper Canada had made. The hon. member went on to point out the great differences between the Upper and Lower Canadians, and argued that if they were to remain united (*sic*), and to become one great Province, it could only be on the basis of admitting one man in Upper Canada to be equal to one man in Lower Canada.<sup>246</sup> It was true that the inhabitants of Upper Canada and Lower Canada were different in language, in religion, in sentiments, and in their institutions, and if as to what was due to Upper Canada on the score of her population, and general interests were not speedily appreciated and full justice done her; a sense of that injustice would compel her to ask for an early disunion of the Provinces. It was very desirable that this should take place, for Upper Canada and Lower Canada had but few sentiments or interest[s] in common, and this had led to the constant clashing of those interests, and the jarrings which were so prevalent in our Legislature. Take for instance the objectionable clauses in the Clergy Reserve Bill, these were forced upon us by the Lower Canada votes, and such had been the case connected with several objectionable Bills which had been forced through the Legislature by their votes.<sup>247</sup> Under the present system many things were forced on Upper Canada, with which Upper Canadians were dissatisfied. If, for example, they had stood by themselves, the probability was that they would not now have a Nunnery established in the city of Toronto. (Hear, hear.)<sup>248</sup>

The vote was then taken upon Mr. Mackenzie's amendment<sup>249</sup>.

(53)

The fifth paragraph being again read as followeth:--That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective.

Mr. Mackenzie moved in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. Aikins, That the words, "and will endeavour to provide, that the several Electoral Districts into which this Province may be divided, under a Census to be taken at an early day, with a view to the elections of Members of the said Legislative Council, and of the Legislative Assembly, shall be arranged as nearly as conveniently may be, upon the equitable principle of representation proportioned according to population, and without regard to a dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada," be added at the end thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

## YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Brown, Christie, DeLong, Ferrie, Flint, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Lumsden, Mackenzie, Matheson, Munro, Murney, Rolph, and Scatcherd.--(17.)

## NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Bureau, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Clarke, Conger, Cooke, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Desaulniers, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Galt, Gamble, Guévremont, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Laporte, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, John S. Macdonald, Attorney General Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, McCann, Masson, Mattice, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Niles, O'Farrell, Papin, Poulin, Powell, Prévost, Rankin, Rohlin, James Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Valois, Whitney, and Young.--(77.)

So it passed in the Negative.<sup>250</sup>

The question being again put on the ... fifth paragraph of the resolution<sup>251</sup>,

MR. CAMERON wished to say a few words in reference to the vote he intended to give against that paragraph of the resolutions, in accordance with the vote[s] he had always given when the same subject had been before the House, notwithstanding the insinuation that he had given them as sham votes. He knew that when gentlemen endeavoured to pursue a consistent course, they were liable to be accused of what was personally dishonouring and dishonest.<sup>252</sup> He was quite aware that both within the walls of that House and outside of them, it was a very usual thing for a member to have his acts, votes and sentiments grossly misrepresented. Some there were who made a trade of it. He (Mr. C.) could not understand why on the floor of that House, and in a debate connected with the address, and how hon. gentlemen should have taken the opportunity descending to an inctutious (sic) act, by impugning the motives which had induced his (Mr. C's) vote.<sup>253</sup> But, whatever differences there might have been between himself and members of this House in reference to the course he had taken since he was first placed on the floor of the united Legislature, he had never felt that any hon. member had ever received at his hands aught but the most uniform courtesy. And he felt that he was entitled to the same courtesy on the

part of every member of the House, as he had always been prepared to deal out himself. He did not know on what principle it was, that because the hon. gentleman (sic) who filled the Treasury Benches had on some matters changed their opinions from what they formerly were, and he believed they had conscientiously changed those opinions, on account of their being convinced that the country was in favour of the change, and because he had not gone with them, and yet, had not been prepared to drive them out of office if in his power, and to put in their places gentlemen with whom he held no single opinion in common--he could not understand, why, because that was the case, he should have been taunted with giving votes for the purpose of advancing selfish purposes of his own, and which he was not prepared to stand before the country to justify. And the insinuation fell badly from a gentleman who could not claim even the merit of originality for the statement, because he had borrowed or stolen it from the columns of a newspaper--a gentleman, too, whose antecedents had shown him to be in favour of a principle which he lacked the courage to carry out to the extent he ought to have carried it, if he desired to carry it out at all. He recollected, too, that the gentleman who had attempted to stamp him with personal dishonour was a gentleman, who, on an occasion which must be well remembered by members of this House, an investigation was going on before a committee, known as the Corruption Committee, into the character of a gentleman who held a high position in this country, and stood high in the estimation of this country--he recollected that that gentleman, when before the committee, claimed a right to refuse to answer a question on the ground that his doing so tender to violate the confidence of private friendship, and yet immediately afterwards a written memorandum of the same thing in his own handwriting was produced by one who was known to be the greatest enemy that the late Inspector General ever had.<sup>254</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order! If that fact was reported by the Committee to the House, it may be mentioned. If not, anything that might have taken place before the Committee, should not be mentioned.<sup>255</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--I consider, sir, that when a man receives a serious provocation, and when that provocation is of a character personal within the walls of the House, which I feel should not be made personal without the walls of it, I say that if a gauntlet is thrown down to me, I have a right to see whether it is from a pure white hand that I take it.<sup>256</sup> In the present case the hon. member did not come into court with very clean hands.<sup>257</sup> If I speak strongly, I use the language which men are apt to use when they feel that a wrong has been done them, and done them by a man who should have been the last to attack another man's character. I am prepared to take my place before my constituents and the people of this country, and to defend the course I have taken and intend to take, and it is for them to determine whether that course is correct. And as regards the present administration, the course I have pursued has been sanctioned by a large body of gentlemen with whom I have always acted both in the House and out of the House. I am prepared to abide by their judgment rather than by the judgment of one, who at the moment he makes the accusation against me, himself stands liable to a greater accusation which the rules of Parliament will not allow me to characterise.<sup>258</sup>

MR. HOLTON then rose and said--I think I may venture to appeal to the candour of this House, and ask whether I made any statement or indulged in any remarks<sup>259</sup> yesterday in reference to the political conduct of the honorable member for Toronto<sup>260</sup> which would justify the hon. gentleman ... in directing against me a fierce personal attack. I did intend to animadvert in the strongest language I could use, on the extraordinary, anomalous and illogical position which that hon. gentleman occupies

before the House and the country, but I endeavoured to draw a line, and I think I succeeded in doing so, between what is political and fairly the subject of criticism by any hon. member of this House, and what is purely personal to the hon. member whose conduct is commented upon. I never intended to reflect on the personal honour of the learned member for the city of Toronto, although I did intend to reflect in the strongest language I could command, on his political relations. But I shall not be tempted by any of the inuendoes or bluster or misrepresentations, the use of which the hon. gentleman may have learned in other scenes than this to indulge in similar language. I shall not be tempted to forget what I owe to the dignity of this House, and what I owe to myself, by descending into the arena of personal altercation. I shall allow the hon. gentleman to roar ad libitum in that arena, unmolested by me. I am no match for him in that sort of warfare, and I should be unworthy of the position I hold in this House as the representative of the foremost constituency in this country, if I so far forgot the objects for which we are assembled here together, as to engage in such warfare. (Hear, hear.) The allusion the honourable gentleman made to certain occurrences before a Committee of this House last session, I am ready to answer at any time and on any occasion. The hon. gentleman has entirely misrepresented those circumstances. He represented me as having refused to answer a question before the Committee<sup>261</sup>, on the ground that it would be a breach of friendship,<sup>262</sup> relating to a point on which a memorandum in my own hand writing was produced? That is not true. The written memorandum did not refer to that point, but to various other points which were matter of public conversation at the time. I regret that my relations with the late Inspector General<sup>263</sup> Mr. Hincks<sup>264</sup> should be made the subject of discussion in his absence, and at this stage of an already too protracted debate. They were for many years of a most intimate character. Having had their origin in political sympathy, they ripened into warm personal friendship. But at the period to which those insinuations referred, circumstances had arisen to estrange us, and it is just possible, as is unfortunately too common in this world, that the antagonism between us, while that estrangement lasted, was in proportion to the previous friendship, and it produced, I believe, misunderstanding and misrepresentation on both sides. But I shall not be dragged into a discussion of my personal relations with that gentleman. Suffice it to say that<sup>265</sup> a perfect reconciliation had taken place before Mr. Hincks left the Province, and under the circumstances it was the more deeply to be regretted that such allusion had taken place<sup>266</sup>. He and I parted, as we had lived for many years, on terms of the closest friendship. As to that I will only remark further that if the hon. gentleman has any new charges to fulminate against me on that subject, I will be glad if he will bring them forward in a shape that will enable me to repel them as they deserve. I think it was an unworthy proceeding at this hour, and in a debate having reference to different matters, to bring forward charges of that nature. The hon. gentleman his (sic) been pleased to announce his determination to continue the extraordinary course which I commented upon yesterday. There is certainly no accounting for tastes. But he has not ventured to grapple with the doctrine I laid down yesterday, he has not denied that the Government, under our system, is responsible for the whole legislation of the country, and that the man who supports the Government on questions on which its existence depends, makes himself responsible for its every act.<sup>267</sup>

Hear, hear, from MR. CAMERON.<sup>268</sup>

[MR. HOLTON:] I would like to hear the hon. gentleman, with all the ingenuity and eloquence, and talent for which I have ever given him credit, attempt to gainsay the correctness of that doctrine. And if he cannot, I ask the House whether the

interferences which I draw, and which I now repeat, warranted the extraordinary attack to which the House has just listened. (Hear, hear.)<sup>269</sup>

A vote was then taken upon the ... [5th] clause of the Address<sup>270</sup>.

(53)

*Then the Question being put on the fifth paragraph; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--*

(53-54)

YEAS.

*Messieurs Aikins, Alleyn, Bellingham, Bourassa, Brodeur, Bureau, Burton, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Christie, Clarke, Conger, Cooke, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Delong, Desaulniers, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Ferrie, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gamble, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Laporte, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, John S. Macdonald, Attorney General Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Mattice, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Munro, Niles, Papin, Poulin, Powell, Prévost, Rankin, Roblin, Rolph, James Ross, Scatcherd, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, Valois, Whitney, and Young.--(88.)*

(54)

NAYS.

*Messieurs Bowes, Brown, Cameron, Flint, and Murney.--(5.)*

*So it was resolved in the Affirmative.*

*The sixth paragraph being again read, as followeth:--That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime, and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration.*

MR. J.S. MACDONALD offered a few remarks upon ... [this] clause<sup>271</sup>.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD ... replied<sup>272</sup>.

An amendment was [then] proposed<sup>273</sup>.

(54)

*The Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald moved in amendment thereto, seconded by Mr. Papin, That all the words after "That" to the end thereof be left out, and the words, "while this House is prepared to consider any wise measure for the prevention of crime, and the speedy apprehension of offenders, it will regard with deep regret and alarm the introduction of any measure to divest the local authorities of these duties, and to create a National Police Force under the control of the Provincial Government," inserted instead thereof;*

Remarks [were] made thereupon by several members<sup>274</sup>.

MR. GALT said he should vote against the amendment. He thought the Government should have an effective force to preserve law and order. He should wait to see the measure itself ere he condemned it.<sup>275</sup>

The House divided on the amendment<sup>276</sup>.

(54)

*And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--*

YEAS.

*Messieurs Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Darche, Delong, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Ferrie, Flint, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, and Young.--(31.)*

(54-55)

NAYS.

*Messieurs Alleyn, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Galt, Guévremont, Laporte, Lemieux, Loranger, Lumsden, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Niles, Poulin, Powell, Rankin, Roblin, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Turcotte, and Whitney.--(58.)*  
*So it passed in the Negative.*

(55)

*Then the sixth paragraph being again read, was agreed to.*

Several divisions on the amendments proposed to the speech then took place--in all of which the amendments were negatived<sup>277</sup> without any discussion<sup>278</sup>, and the remaining clauses of the address carried by overwhelming majorities.<sup>279</sup>

(55)

*The seventh to the fifteenth paragraphs, being again read, were agreed to.*

*The fifteenth and sixteenth paragraphs being again read, and the Question put thereon; the House divided:--And it was resolved in the Affirmative.*

*Then the subsequent paragraphs being again read, were agreed to.*

After the amendments had all been rejected and the several clauses of the Address adopted by the House, on the motion of general concurrence,<sup>280</sup>

MR. BROWN rose at half-past one o'clock in the morning<sup>281</sup> and said he had waited patiently till all the gentlemen opposite had got through with their attacks upon him,<sup>282</sup> and those gentlemen on that side of the House with whom he was acting,<sup>283</sup> and he would now with the leave of the House, say a few words in reply. He alluded to the fact that not fewer than five Cabinet Ministers and many of their supporters had made ... [him] the one theme of their speeches;<sup>284</sup> and he would ask hon. members if they sincerely thought their opposition arose solely from a spirit of faction? Safely could he answer for himself they did not, and must say, that he considered the remarks uncalled for, and that the Opposition were not deserving of them.<sup>285</sup> Even had all their fulminations and accusations been correct, that would have been no defence of the conduct and measures of the Administration. He then went on to refute *seriatim*,<sup>286</sup> the various charges made by members of the administration against the opposition for want of harmony and unity. He attacked the ministry for want of consistency and unity--with having sacrificed long cherished principles for sake of office.<sup>287</sup> It had been asked how could he (Mr. B.) assent to form a party

out of the discordant materials on his side of the house? He may retort upon the hon. gentlemen and ask them how it was that they had formed a government out of such discordant materials which are on that side of the house?<sup>288</sup> The Attorney Gen. West had asked how he could sit by the side of the member for Glengarry who entertained different views on some points; but he would ask how the Attorney General West could sit by the side of the Post Master General. The Attorney General West had sacrificed his principles and abandoned his party for the purpose of obtaining an office and forming a Government. He (Mr. B.) could have made a Government and obtained office on the same terms. The Attorney Gen. West, in making that attack, had paid him (Mr. B.) a compliment at his own expense. The Attorney General had charged him with working for a coalition Government and turning on that coalition after it had been formed. He admitted that he had worked for a coalition Government--a coalition that would work for the interests of the people of Upper Canada, and<sup>289</sup> not for such a coalition, as now sat on the Treasury Benches. Those gentlemen who sat there were merely doing the bidding of the Lower Canadians.<sup>290</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE here rose to order. He could not permit such assertions to proceed without giving a prompt denial.<sup>291</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER having offered some remarks upon the point of order<sup>292</sup>,

MR. BROWN proceeded that he was surprised that the hon. Postmaster General had the indecency to state that he (Mr. B.) had worked for the Conservatives and had voted for them. He would tell the hon. gentleman that it would have been well if he had first gone to the journals of the house before he had overturned that assertion--he has no right to say that I was identified with and working for the Tories. Upon a reference to the votes of the house it would be found that more [than] one half voted against me.<sup>293</sup> The Attorney General at that time had agreed with him [Mr. B.] thoroughly. He had even put a motion on the Journal, calling the Bill proposed by the Attorney General East for the commutation of the Feudal Tenure a robbery--had agreed with him (Mr. B.) in his opposition to the Bill to render the Legislative Council elective--but now the Atty. General abandoned the opinions he then entertained. It was the force of office, and he said it. The Attorney General West had gone even further than that; he had abandoned the principles for which he had long battled on the Clergy Reserves, but refrained from making the change in his views known until after he had obtained office. The member for Hamilton boldly avowed at the hustings that he could no longer attempt to carry out his old views in opposition to the wishes of the majority--that if the majority were in favor of Secularization he would bow to their wishes, but the member for Kingston, in his speech at the hustings maintained exactly the same principles which he had always advocated.<sup>294</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--How do you know that?<sup>295</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Knew it from his speech, from the published report.<sup>296</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--Then that report is as false as the statement you make now.<sup>297</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order!<sup>298</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--If the member for Lambton will make statements that are false, he must expect me to tell him so.<sup>299</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order, the Attorney-General West is out of order.<sup>300</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Sir, the Attorney-Genl. West knows that I am one of those that will not take that course out of doors which some people adopt, under circumstances of this kind, and he feels at liberty to insult me<sup>301</sup>.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD taunted him with using his religious principles as a screen under which to slander people, and avoid personal responsibility.<sup>302</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] I think that a man standing in his position at the head of the law, ought to know better what is due to the dignity of the House if not to himself, than to make use of such language.<sup>303</sup> He would beg leave to remind hon. gentlemen that they should not despise this opposition for it is larger than one, who, on a former occasion drove an administration from office. And the reason the present one is retained in their seats is because they dare not carry out their professed principles. The hon. gentlemen know well that they commit a wrong when they make the charge that he (Mr. B.) was the open and avowed enemy of the reform party. The hon. Postmaster General was wrong in charging him with breaking up the Baldwin administration--he would tell the hon. gentleman that it ill became him to make that charge since he had so acted and laid himself out in such a way as to secure office but not so as to secure himself the respect of himself or the country.<sup>304</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE, it is not so.<sup>305</sup>

MR. BROWN ... [asserted] that at the election of 1851 Mr. Spence held ultra-Liberal opinions<sup>306</sup>. [He] read over the planks of a platform erected by the Clear Grit party in the County of Halton, which embraced a great many progressive doctrines, among them being "Representation by Population," "No Sectarian Schools," and "No Ecclesiastical Corporations," and stated that that declaration of principle had been adopted by Mr. Spence before the election of 1851.<sup>307</sup>

The reading of the "platform" was received with great approbation by the Opposition, and ill-concealed chagrin by the Ministerial side of the House.<sup>308</sup>

[MR. BROWN continued:] The hon. Postmaster General was of opinion at that time that representation should be founded on population, that the vote should be taken by ballot and there should be an Elective Legislative Council--retrenchment of the public expenditure of the Province. Such was the platform agreed to at the Halton meeting and supported by the Dundas Warder, the property of the hon. Postmaster General.<sup>309</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE interrupted Mr. Brown, to say that he had not constructed that "platform," that he had not signed it, and that he had refused to have anything to do with it.<sup>310</sup>

[MR. BROWN] replied that it was very true that the Postmaster General had refused to give a pledge in writing, but he had declared that the principles laid down in it were his, and upon that declaration he was nominated by the Convention.<sup>311</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--It is not true.<sup>312</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order.<sup>313</sup>

MR. BROWN knew it was true and could prove it to be true; for the Postmaster-Gen. had denied it before, and he had consequently traced it up and established it beyond doubt.<sup>314</sup> He named Mr. Benjamin Overfield, of Dundas, as his authority, and promised to bring further proof if necessary.<sup>315</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--It is untrue.<sup>316</sup>

MR. BROWN.--And he actually wrote from Quebec to his paper, setting forth the claims of his friend from Glengarry in opposition to the administration candidate.<sup>317</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--It is untrue.<sup>318</sup>

MR. BROWN continued; that was all the members of the administration could say in reply to the charge[s] made against them--it is untrue, it is untrue. The Postmaster-General did so; yet he sits by the side of the Attorney-General West. He had stated that the Postmaster-General in his paper, had advocated the election to the Speakership of his friend from Glengarry but if hon. members would take the trouble to refer to a file of that paper, the Dundas Warder, and cut scraps from it as they had done from the Globe, for the purpose of charging him with inconsistency, they would find that the Postmaster-General had far gone beyond him in the vehemence of his radical opinions, and in his views on Church matters.<sup>319</sup> I can produce my authority that Mr. Spence said he was opposed to the Baldwin settlement of ... the Clergy Reserves question up to a certain time. When there was some trouble arising out of the expenses of the Haldimand election, he (Mr. B.) begged leave to tell the hon. gentleman that there was not one word of truth in the assertion, having paid the whole of the expenses of that election out of his own pocket, and which indeed was of itself but a very small affair, so trifling that it was barely worth mentioning. The hon. gentleman has also said that another reason why he (Mr. B.) had withdrawn his support from the government was because he had lost their patronage<sup>320</sup>; so far from this being the case, he had received that patronage for a year after he withdrew his support from them. The patronage he received was actually worth nothing; but such as it was, he received far more during the year after he withdrew his support than at any previous time; and he had no doubt if he wanted the patronage of hon. gentlemen opposite he could obtain it to-morrow.<sup>321</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER.--I would not give you a copper.<sup>322</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Then it would not be the virtue of hon. gentlemen opposite which would prevent them from giving it to him, when he looked round the benches behind the ministry and saw how many hon. gentlemen sitting there, were in receipt of nice little fat jobs, Commissionerships and all sorts of pickings, he was quite certain that it was not the virtue of hon. gentlemen opposite which prevented him from obtaining their patronage, and that he could have it if he wished.<sup>323</sup> He (Mr. B.) could tell the hon. gentleman [Mr. Spence] that such things had been heard of as Commissionerships for revising the statutes of Upper Canada, and six also for Lower Canada Commissionerships for the deepening of the St. Lawrence--also for an examination of the debts of corporations and with such commissionships and others in existence, the Hon. Postmaster (sic) General may have well spared his observations. The hon. gentleman has also stated that in 1851, when my services would have been of the greatest benefit to the reform party, I turned traitor to that party. At that time I supported the Hon. Postmaster General, and his paper, then under the management of Mr. Jones<sup>324</sup>--

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE [said] not true<sup>325</sup>.

[MR. BROWN:] The hon. gentleman says it is not true, but I tell him that it is true<sup>326</sup>. The Postmaster General previous to and at the election of 1854 was in opposition to the then Administration, and ... he was the Opposition candidate, and his opponent, Mr. Miller, the Ministerialist.<sup>327</sup> And [I] would farther remind him that he went to the caucus, and there agreed to Mr. J.S. MacDonald's nomination for the speakership--but the moment the present Premier raised his figure (sic), and offered the hon. gentleman a place, there he was on the Treasury Benches, forgetting all his profession, and sacrificing his promises, his profession and his party. A great many other points presented themselves, arising out of the debate which had taken place, which he would like to briefly touch upon, if time did but permit. One, however, is too important to be omitted, the charge of having deserted the reform party in 1851, but from that time up to the present moment ... [I] would defy the hon. gentleman to point out any vote of mine, proving that I had deserted the reform party or reform principles. He (Mr. B.) had made up his mind to oppose any government that was not based upon reform principles. He would further refer to those great questions of reform, what at one time could not be spoken of openly, and only twenty supporters could be found, but which dare not be openly spoken of on the floor of that House, but which now are taken up openly, and which he (Mr. B.) had always consistantly struggled for; why then was he to be told that he had deserted reform principles?<sup>328</sup> The result of the extraordinary coalition they had seen carried out between the hon. gentlemen opposite was to be witnessed every day. It was only a few days since the House had seen the member for Toronto getting up in his place and urging exactly the same sentiments which he had tried to obtain a hearing for in Quebec, and had been denounced for, yet now that hon. gentleman had taken precisely the same ground and led of[f] 10 or 12 Conservatives from the support of the Min[i]sters. And now we are told that a caucus (sic) meeting of Reformers was held two or three days ago and that they informed the Ministry that there must be a change in their policy<sup>329</sup>, or they would not secure there (sic) continued support.<sup>330</sup>

No, no, from MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD, there is no truth in the assertion<sup>331</sup>.

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE.--Nothing of the kind.<sup>332</sup>

Hear, hear, from various parts of the House.<sup>333</sup>

MR. MCCANN asked if it were for the hon. member for Lambton to make attacks on the hon. member for Toronto when that gentleman was absent from his seat.<sup>334</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It is all very well for the hon. member, who had been attending to his private affairs, and had only peeped into the House within the last day or two, to ask that question; the hon. member had not the latest news. If he had been present in his place he would have heard it from the gentleman himself ... that he had carried off ten or twelve Conservatives--(laughter)--from the Ministerial benches.<sup>335</sup> Mr. Brown continued, he was of opinion that hon. gentlemen, whatever their opinions may be, would at least give him (Mr. B.) credit for sincerity in the exexcise (sic) of his opinions.<sup>336</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--Did you give Dr. Rolph equal credit for sincerity?<sup>337</sup>

MR. BROWN went into some explanation of the position and differences between himself, Dr. Rolph, and the member for Brant, and added that it was his persuasion that the opinions held by himself and the gentlemen on that side of the House were

the opinions of the country of the whole people of Canada--admitted in reference to what had been read from the newspapers as to his proceedings at the Hamilton election, that it was his aim and full determination to break down the late administration--gave a short history of what had occurred at a meeting of reformers, at which the member for Brant was present--a compact made to place reformers in each of the vacancies if one could be had, if not, to assist any anti-ministerialist--admitted that his opposition to Mr. Buchanan's election in Hamilton had arisen from private feelings, Mr. Buchanan having endeavored in a most insidious manner to impu[g]ne him (Mr. B.) with the electors of Lambton.<sup>338</sup> Mr. Brown continued at some length to accuse the Ministry of having exhibited throughout a want of principle, to have lost every claim of consistency, and to occupy before the House and the country the position of men so anxious for office, as to abandon every principle they ever professed.<sup>339</sup> The hon. gentleman concluded a very lengt[h]y speech with a regret that he could not at that late hour touch upon one or two other points of grert (sic) moment.<sup>340</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE here rose, when<sup>341</sup>--

[MR. MACKENZIE] and some others pointed at the early hour of the morning.<sup>342</sup>

[MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE] trusted the hon. member for Haldimand, and other hon. members would ... regardless of the warning of the time piece, grant him a short time.<sup>343</sup>

Permission having been acceded after many cries of adjourn<sup>344</sup>,

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE proceeded. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that you should have had to call me to order for having used an unparliamentary phrase. And, Mr. Speaker, I must at the same time say that I am not in the habit of using a term which one gentleman should not indulge in towards another unless very greatly provoked. But, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the hon. member for Lambton is in the habit of rising and hurrying on in that rapid style from one subject to another<sup>345</sup> for the purpose of evading detection, and preventing reply<sup>346</sup>, that if it deserves that an answer should at once be given to a misstatement, it is requisite that an emported denial should at once be given--it is desirable that like a spurious coin you should at once nail it to the counter and prevent its further circulation in the country where its dubious qualities may not be so well known. Such it was the motive for my prompt denial, for such a course has often been resorted to by the member for Lambton at the end of a protracted debate. The erroneous assertions (sic) appears in his paper of the next morning--is concluded and without the opportunity of being contradicted until it is too late and has affected the purpose for which the hon. member for Lambton intended it. Mr. Spence here gave a version of the proceedings which had taken place, and which were dramatically opposed to those expressed by the hon. member for Lambton who had ... and formed his opinion, upon those views expressed by him (Mr. S.) and not the company as asserted. He would directly charge that hon. gentleman with doing all in his power to impede the business of the country and those important measures so essential to its peace and prosperity<sup>347</sup>. He had already stated that that hon. gentleman was the open and avowed foe of the reform party, and could prove the perfect accuracy of that statement, from the measures supported by the hon. gentleman on the Clergy Reserves Bill, and at the last general election. The last clause of Mr. Price's 29 resolutions was the basis of the settlement moved by the House at its last session, and he supposed that the member for Lambton could not, and dare

not, deny that he had supported these resolutions. Yet when the bill founded on them was introduced into Parliament, to serve his own purposes, and gratify his own propensities, he resisted that which the reform party had so long struggled for, and even brought down his opposition to the present day. He had abandoned his party, created disunion in his party, opposed with all his might the consummation of all the great measures of his party, and then turned round on him, Mr. Spence, and charged him who had carried out his party views and party measures, with being a traitor. For himself he had no regrets for the events of the past, no fears for the future.<sup>348</sup> The hon. member for Lambton had charged him, Mr. Spence, with joining the Tories, but considering the measures which had been brought forward and carried, he believed he was supported by men of moderate views on all sides<sup>349</sup>. The member for Lambton--a disappointed man--a man who had worked and battled for the Coalition, and who now vented his spleen against the Coalition, must not expect that he (Mr. S.) could be overwhelmed by such charges. When he looked around and saw the support the Coalition received, in consequence of their carrying out the promises they had made, when he saw on the division last night that it was sustained by a majority of 38 to 18 Upper Canada members<sup>350</sup> [OR] the ... vote of 58 to 18<sup>351</sup>, he felt satisfied that the censure of the hon. member for Lambton was but lightly attended to by the House or the country.<sup>352</sup> The hon. member for Lambton had expressed himself annoyed that he was (sic) called the most open and avowed enemy that the Reform party ever had; but such, nevertheless, was the fact, and here let the hon. gentleman rise in his seat and ask the hon. member for Norfolk this one question "was I faithful to my party?" Mr. Spence then took a brief and rapid glance at the various turns of the member in the political game which he had been playing which he said fully proved that he had been false to his principles and a traitor to his party, and particularly alluding to his conduct in 1852, just as when Earl Grey had retired and Earl Derby came in, and when it was supposed (sic) the great principles which had been so long contended for in this Province were endangered. Such was the time chosen (sic) by the hon. member for Lambton to declare that it was better to let the Tories come into power for even eight years than for them to gain the country at an election.<sup>353</sup> Was it consistent that the hon. gentleman should attack the Coalition when he had labored for it; to charge others with having betrayed the reform party, when he had advocated the election of Tories throughout the country, instead of Reformers; when he had advocated the election of Sir Allan MacNab against Mr. Buchanan an old and staunch friend of secularization, when he had advocated the election of the Attorney General West, and he had been anxious to go down to Renfrew to oppose Mr. Hincks.<sup>354</sup> And such was the conduct of the hon. gentleman at that time that it did prove him the greatest enemy the Reform party ever had; and that he was a tra[i]tor to his principles and to his party. And from that time to the present the hon. gentleman has remained so. But it was necessary that he (Mr. Spence) should briefly remind this House of the manner in which the hon. member for Lambton is in the habit of making statements before that House which were simply not true. The hon. gentleman made an observation as to his (Mr. Spence's) connection at a certain time with the Dundas Warder, whereas the fact was that his connection with that paper had ceased more than twelve months previously. (Hear, hear). The circumstance to which the hon. member for Lambton had had reference, occurring in 1851, and he (Mr. Spence) ceased to have any connection with the Dundas Warder in 1849.<sup>355</sup> He denied that he had subscribed to the Halton platform. He denied that he had adopted that platform. He denied that he had accepted that platform. He would go further, he refused that platform, when it was presented to him; he had illustrated his objection to the whole principle of constructing platforms, by pulling out a slip of paper from his pocket, and saying he would never put himself in such a position, if he should go into the Legislature, as

to need reference to a slip of paper to remind him how to vote. That fact he could prove by fifty persons who were then present, and he could not refrain from calling the attention of the House to the coolness and boldness of the hon. member in making such statements about facts of which he knew nothing. He would ask if it were not bold, if it were not mendacious in the hon. gentleman to do so?<sup>356</sup> Under these circumstances and with such direct perversion (sic) of facts he did trust that the hon. member for Lambton would take memory and be more careful of his statements. Mr. Spence wound up by charging the hon. member for Lambton with taking the course he had all along done to carry out personal vindictiveness.<sup>357</sup> He would add in conclusion that the hon. gentleman flattered himself on account of the attention that he had received from members of the Administration, but that he would never receive it again, for he had been stripped of his false colors and he stood in his true position.<sup>358</sup>

MR. CHRISTIE, of Brant, rose, and disregarding altogether the attempts made to interrupt him,<sup>359</sup> said that the member for Lambton had quoted from the platform which he said had been presented to and accepted by the P.M.G. He would say that that statement made by the member for Lambton, was true. He did not mean to say that the Post Master General constructed that platform. It was constructed by a convention of delegates at Glenmorris, in the Township of Dumfries, and it was intended to procure the election of Post Master General.<sup>360</sup> He informed the House that he was present when that "platform" was framed, that he knew the members of the Convention which nominated Mr. Spence, and he named them; he knew that they were instructed to vote for no man who would not declare his adhesion to the "platform," and he was informed that Mr. Spence had given that adhesion.<sup>361</sup> He would admit that the Post Master General refused to subscribe to that platform, but that he told the delegates that it received his assent and that he concurred in its principles.<sup>362</sup> In support of his statement, he read a letter from a delegate to the Convention, of a late date, who narrated the same circumstances.<sup>363</sup> He also stated from his own knowledge that Mr. Spence was opposed to the Government in 1854.<sup>364</sup>

MR. POST. GEN. SPENCE again flatly denied that he had ever given his adhesion to the platform.<sup>365</sup>

MR. HARTMAN, in a quiet, quizzical way, said that, in April 1854, before the fall of the late Government, he attended a celebrated libel trial at Hamilton, as a witness; that he had met there a gentleman, now Postmaster-General, along with some other persons;<sup>366</sup> that he well recollected being told by Mr. Spence ... that he (Mr. S.) was against the Government;<sup>367</sup> and that, on the street, in the middle of a group surrounding a post, he had received from that gentleman the worst scolding he ever had in his life, because he had not supported the member for Lambton in opposing the Hincks' Government.<sup>368</sup> The words used by the hon. gentleman were, that he [Mr. Hartman] endorsed all the acts of that corrupt and degraded administration; and after that lecture he had followed the advice of the Postmaster General, and he was extremely surprised to find that while he did so that hon. gentleman himself took directly the opposite course. From that moment he lost all confidence in the hon. member and utterly refused to follow him as a leader.<sup>369</sup>

All this produced a strong sensation in the House<sup>370</sup>.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose in a state of wild excitement.<sup>371</sup> [He] said the course taken by the last speaker in debating to that House a private and confidential conversation was to say, the least of it, in very bad taste, and reminded

the hon. gentleman that on the next occasion of the kind he would advise him to have some more respectable witness than a "post." Mr. Macdonald next alluded to the observation made by the hon. member for Lambton<sup>372</sup>. I have met many strange characters and many disagreeable in politics, but I am sorry to say that I never met any so cool, so disreputable, as the member for Lambton. That hon. gentleman made erroneous charges knowing them to be erroneous, and when he is taxed with their falsity,<sup>373</sup> he shirks away to make others equally untrue. That hon. member said that he had, in the published report of his [Mr. Macdonald's] speech delivered at Kingston, the authority for a statement he had made<sup>374</sup>, whereas it was a fact that there was no report of such speech, nor had any speech been made. Was it a member who had placed himself in such a position that the administration are afraid of? The hon. member for Lambton and some other hon. members have remarked that the attacks of the Government were directed particularly against the hon. member for Lambton, because the Government were afraid of him. The hon. member for Lambton has declared that he supported Sir Allan Macnab in order to break down the Hincks administration, what then was his other explanation of his opposition to Mr. Jas. Buchanan with that he opposed him in Hamilton because he had acted with great hostility and opposed him in his election for Lambton? Such are the contradictions which meets (*sic*) us in every turn and phase of the political life of the hon. member for Lambton, and such may be considered about the amount and worth of all his assertions. He (Mr. McDonald,) regretted that he had suffered himself to be led into a remark which was unparliamentary, and for which at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker, he had apologized (*sic*), but when it is considered how difficult it is to keep the temper when the hon. member for Lambton is so constantly in the habit of mentioning statements which are the reverse of facts, some allowance should be made. Mr. McDonald then<sup>375</sup> [spoke] of the appointment of the member for Lambton to the Penitentiary Commission<sup>376</sup>. Il rapporta qu'il y a environ huit ans M. Brown avait été nommé conjointement avec quatre autres commissaires pour faire une enquête sur l'administration du pénitencier de Kingston.<sup>377</sup> He proceeded (*sic*) to say that Mr. Brown had used the most nefarious means to destroy the character of the Warden, Mr. Smith, father of the Solicitor-General West. As Secretary of the Commission, he had entire control of the evidence<sup>378</sup>. [He] referred to the manner in which the Penitentiary Commission had been conducted by the hon. member for Lambton, charging him with assembling with locked doors, and would not allow poor old Mr. Smith to be present to cross-examine the witnesses; and when his son came in he was told that he could take notes upon one consideration--that he would keep a quiet tongue in his head. The Hon. Mr. MacDonald was also informed that the Penitentiary Commissioner had actually<sup>379</sup> falsified testimony; he had added to the testimony of witnesses behind their backs; he had suborned convict witnesses, and obtained the pardon of murderers to induce them to give false evidence<sup>380</sup> against Mr. Smith. Mr. Baldwin was desirous of having a Committee appointed to enquire into the matter, but the Penitentiary Commissioner broug[h]t all his screws to bear upon Mr. Baldwin to suppress it; although Mr. Baldwin would not bring the matter on by Committee, he marked his sense of the transaction by refusing to get up in his place in Parliament and defend the Penitentiary Commissioner; neither would Mr. Richards have anything to do with it. The Penitentiary Commissioner never forgot that. And what was more, he never forgave it.<sup>381</sup>

MR. BROWN ... said: I never spoke to Mr. Richards--<sup>382</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--Does the hon. gentleman want the proof? The proof is in the House.<sup>383</sup>

MR. CASAULT.--I was sitting in the gallery at the time the member for Kingston moved for the appointment of the committee. The member [Mr. Brown], who was sitting by me, told Mr. Richards to refuse the motion for a committee. (Great confusion.)<sup>384</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH.--There! YOU ARE A CONVICTED LIAR! Sit down.<sup>385</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--The Solicitor General is out of order. He has used unparliamentary language, and must retract it.<sup>386</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I hope these words will be taken down.<sup>387</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH.--I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having used that language; but after what has been said about a relation of my own by the member for Lambton, I think I was justified in doing so.<sup>388</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER. I cannot allow the Solicitor General to say he was justified in using unparliamentary language.<sup>389</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH.--I withdraw the expression.<sup>390</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD continued:] At this time the grand aim of the Penitentiary Commissioner was to cut out a situation in the Penitentiary for his father. There are parties who could prove these things; who can prove that the Penitentiary Commissioner suborned (sic) witnesses, and those convicted criminals, to give evidence against Mr. Smith; and, farther, who would, as he had been informed, prove that the evidence had been falsified, after it had been delivered by the witnesses.<sup>391</sup>

This announcement was ... received by the House with an amount of amazement, and a complete thrill of excitement pervaded the members and spectators, in the midst of which--<sup>392</sup>

MR. BROWN rose, and pale with excitement,<sup>393</sup> stated that the allegations of the Attorney General had not a vestige of truth in them; that he had taken down his words and would hold him responsible to prove what he had charged. He would move to-morrow for a Committee of Inquiry, and the Attorney General would have full opportunity to establish his allegation if he could.<sup>394</sup>

This announcement, cheered by the Opposition, seemed to throw the Ministerial camp into confusion<sup>395</sup>.

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD here stated that he could then produce a witness who was present in the House when the discussion was brought on, and who sat before Mr. Brown, whom he did not then know, and heard a conversation of that gentleman which he then came forward and related, to the further annoyance of the House.<sup>396</sup>

MR. BROWN proceeded to address the House, but was called to order<sup>397</sup>.

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER ... expressed a wish that as the member for Lambton had exhausted his intentions of moving for a committee of enquiry upon the subject..., further discussion must be suspended.<sup>398</sup>

[The Address was then passed.]

(55)

*Resolved*, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session of the Provincial Parliament:

To assure His Excellency that this House appreciates the motives which have induced him to call them together at this season in compliance with what His Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of Legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by His Excellency to profit by their advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently afforded:

That in referring to their labours of last Session, this House concurs in the satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. That they are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among Municipalities, and that they will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums:

That they learn with much satisfaction, that in Lower Canada the Act for the abolition of the Seignioral Tenure promises, in like manner, to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. They thank His Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by him in acting on the powers conferred by this Law, and that they have no doubt they will be satisfied with the progress which has been made:

That this House will not fail to give its best attention to any measure that may be submitted, having for its object a change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective:

That they rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime, and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before them, and assure His Excellency of their readiness to afford it their most attentive consideration:

That this House feels fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demand increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law, and by the perfect sense of security from outrage:

That His Excellency may confidently rely on their readiness to afford him the necessary means of ensuring these great objects:

That this House feels satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that afforded by our extended lines of Railway. They rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines eastward to St. Thomas, and westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign

(56)

and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with His Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that, since their last meeting, nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year:

That they cordially unite in opinion with His Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. They are pleased to learn that one measure, at least, having reference to this important subject will be submitted to them. They also share in the hope expressed by His Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some

progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments:

That this House will give their best attention to the adoption of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge their Legislative labours, in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions of private institutions of every kind:

That they share in the regret expressed by His Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which he has directed to be laid before this House, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols:

That this House is fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with His Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice:

That this House is gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and they participate in the hope expressed by His Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts:

That this House receives with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled His Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that His Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the Adjutant General, done his best to carry out the wishes of Parliament by organizing a Sedentary Militia:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season:

That this House share in the deep regret expressed by His Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. They cordially unite with His Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check:

That this House assures His Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before them, will receive their most attentive consideration:

That they are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs' Duties which were made by Parliament last year:

That this House learns with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts, consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to them by His Excellency's advisers. They fully agree in the opinion expressed by His Excellency, that although a large decrease has been caused by the Reci-

(57)

procuity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce and by the facility of intercourse between the two countries:

That this House assures His Excellency that he may confidently rely on their readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the Public Service:

*That they feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; that on this side of the Atlantic, we have however, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. They fully concur with His Excellency in the belief that in no part however of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada:*

*That we agree with His Excellency, that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings, and exulted in the success of the allied armies:*

*That this House cordially unites with His Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will rejoice at the termination of the war, and they fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of His Excellency, before the end of the present Session, to congratulate them on so auspicious an event.*

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND then moved a resolution upon the address for the appointment of a committee to act conformally with a Committee of the Upper House, [and] to wait upon His Excellency the Governor General, to ascertain when it would please him to receive the two Houses with the address on the speech.<sup>399</sup>

(57)

*Resolved, That the said Resolution be referred to a Select Committee, composed of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, Mr. Conger, Mr. Chapais, Mr. Dufresne, Mr. Daly, Mr. Loranger and Mr. Roblin, to prepare and report the draught of an Address in answer to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Legislature, in conformity to the said Resolution.*

*The Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond reported, from the Select Committee appointed to draw up an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, That they had drawn up an Address accordingly; and the same was read as followeth:--*

*To His Excellency Sir Edmund Walker Head, Baronet, Governor General of British North America, and Captain General and Governor in Chief in and over the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Island of Prince Edward, and Vice-Admiral of the same, &c., &c., &c.*

*We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly thank Your Excellency for your Gracious Speech from the Throne at the opening of the present Session.*

*We assure Your Excellency that we appreciate the motives which have induced you to call us together at this season, in compliance with what Your Excellency believes to be the wish of the Country, that the task of legislation should not be delayed until a later period of the year, and the desire expressed by Your Excellency to profit by our advice and assistance when they may be most conveniently offered.*

*In referring to our labors of last Session, we concur in the satisfaction expressed by Your Excellency at the settlement of the disputed question of the Clergy Reserves. We are pleased to learn that a large balance of Funds arising from this source will be available for distribution among the Municipalities; and we will cheerfully consider any measures that may be required to give full effect to the fair and equal allotment of these sums.*

*We learn with much satisfaction that, in Lower Canada, the Act for the abolition of the Seigniorial Tenure promises, in like manner, to close a long pending controversy by an equitable adjustment of existing claims. We thank Your Excellency for the assurance that no time has been lost by you in acting on the powers conferred by*

(58)

this Law, and we have no doubt we shall be satisfied with the progress which has been made.

We will not fail to give our best attention to any measure that may be submitted having for its object a change in the constitution of the Legislative Council, by rendering it elective.

We rejoice to learn that a measure for the organization of a Provincial Police, capable of being applied by the Crown for the prevention of Crime and the speedy apprehension of Offenders, will be laid before us, and we assure Your Excellency of our readiness to afford it our most attentive consideration.

We feel fully sensible that the increasing wealth and prosperity of the Country demands increased protection for property, and that the advance of civilization in Canada should be marked by the strict enforcement of Law and by the perfect sense of security from outrage.

Your Excellency may confidently rely on our readiness to afford you the necessary means of ensuring these great objects.

We feel satisfied that no mark of our increasing prosperity can be stronger than that offered by our extended lines of Railway. We rejoice in the fact that this progress is not confined to one Section of the Province, and that the lines Eastward to St. Thomas, and Westward to Guelph and Hamilton, at once the sign and cause of progress, are already completed, and humbly agree with Your Excellency that it is a matter of congratulation that since our last meeting, nearly two hundred and fifty miles have been got into working order, whilst it is hoped that no less than two hundred and fifty more will be finished before next year.

We cordially unite in opinion with Your Excellency that legal reforms are needed both in Eastern and Western Canada. We are pleased to learn that one measure at least, having reference to this important subject, will be submitted to us. We also share in the hope expressed by Your Excellency that, although it may not be possible in the present Session to effect all that we may desire, some progress will be made in simplifying the procedure, and facilitating the working of our Courts by the adoption of practical amendments.

We will give our best attention to the consideration of any general measure which may tend still more to abridge our Legislative labors, in providing for the incorporation, and for laying down the conditions on which private institutions of every kind may become incorporated.

We share in the regret expressed by Your Excellency, that the Presentments of numerous Grand Juries throughout the Country, which you have directed to be laid before us, shew too clearly the want of improvement in the construction and discipline of our Gaols.

We are fully alive to the importance of considering whether we cannot combine the reform of Juvenile offenders with the punishment of their crimes, and concur in opinion with Your Excellency, that, at the very least, it is incumbent upon us to take care that such punishment does not in itself afford fresh opportunities for debasing the criminal and instructing him in vice.

We are gratified to learn that the Board of Audit, constituted by the Act of last Session, is already at work, and we participate in the hope expressed by Your Excellency, that it will contribute to ensure a satisfactory examination of the Public Accounts.

We receive with peculiar gratification the assurance that, with regard to the Militia Act, the ready loyalty of the inhabitants, both in Upper and Lower Canada, has enabled Your Excellency to authorize the formation of numerous Troops and Companies of Volunteers, whose conduct and discipline will undoubtedly do credit to the Province, and that Your Excellency has, moreover, with the assistance of the

Adjutant General, done your best to carry out the wishes of Parliament, by organizing the Sedentary Militia.

We learn with satisfaction that the Government has, in pursuance of the wishes

(59)

of the Legislature, concluded a fresh arrangement calculated to secure a line of Ocean Steamers from the St. Lawrence to England during the approaching season.

We share in the deep regret expressed by Your Excellency at the depression of the Timber Trade, a feeling that must be participated in by all who have at heart the welfare of the Province. We cordially unite with Your Excellency in the hope that we are about to witness its revival, and that the Commerce of Quebec and Montreal will have suffered but a temporary check.

We assure Your Excellency that the Accounts of the past year, and the Estimates for the present, when laid before us, will receive our most attentive consideration.

We are glad to learn that our Finances are, on the whole, in a satisfactory state; the people at large having reaped the benefits of those reductions in the Customs duties which were made by Parliament last year.

We learn with satisfaction that the diminution in the receipts, consequent on such reductions, nearly corresponds with the calculation submitted to us by Your Excellency's advisers. We fully agree in the opinion expressed by Your Excellency, that, although a large decrease has been caused by the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, any such apparent loss is more than compensated by the increased commerce, and by the facility of intercourse between the two Countries.

We assure Your Excellency that you may confidently rely on our readiness to grant the Supplies necessary for the public service.

We feel deeply that the year just ended has been one of difficulty and conflict in Europe; and we are gratified that on this side of the Atlantic, we have, by the blessing of Providence, escaped the direct evils of war. We fully concur with Your Excellency in the belief that in no part of Her Majesty's Dominions has a deeper sympathy with Her Arms been shewn, or more fervent prayers for their success been offered than in Canada.

We agree with Your Excellency that our people have eagerly watched every turn of the contest, and consisting as they do, of men of French and English origin, equal members of the same free community, and loyal subjects of the same Queen, they have grieved at the sufferings and exulted in the success of the allied armies.

We cordially unite with Your Excellency in the belief that in like manner, should it please God to establish a firm and honorable peace, Canada will rejoice at the termination of the War, and we fervently join in the hope that it may be the lot of Your Excellency, before the end of the present Session, to congratulate us on so auspicious an event.

The said Address being read a second time, was agreed to.

Ordered, That the said Address be engrossed.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by the whole House.

Ordered, That such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province do wait upon His Excellency the Governor General, to know His Excellency's pleasure, when he will be attended by this House with its Address.

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,

The House adjourned.<sup>400</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 26 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. This petition was not subsequently read in the House, but GLOBE, 27 February 1856, reports it relates to "the establishment of a township line between the Townships of Elmsley and Montague." It appears that Mr. Shaw again presented a similar petition from the same municipality, reported by the JOURNALS to have been introduced on the 31st March 1856, and read on the 2nd April.
2. GLOBE, 27 February 1856, also reports two petitions which are not found in the JOURNALS of this day. It reports that Dr. Valois presented a petition from Joseph Albert and others; according to the JOURNALS, Mr. Jobin presented on the 18th February 1856 a similar petition from Joseph Allard and others, which was read on the 20th February. Globe also reports Mr. Munro presented a petition from the Municipality of Darlington; according to the JOURNALS, it was presented by this member on the 22nd February 1856, and read on the 25th February.
3. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, reports the debate was resumed at about 4 o'clock.
4. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
5. IBID.
6. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
7. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
8. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, reports the following comment: "Ces dernières paroles prononcées avec un demi-sourire malin, arrachent un tressaillement de joie à l'hon. membre de Napierville, et au contraire foudroient tellement l'hon. député de Québec qu'il ne lui reste plus de force pour répondre à la question insidieuse de l'hon. représentant de Beauharnais."
9. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
10. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
11. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
12. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
13. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
14. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
15. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
16. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
17. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
18. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856. To corroborate Mr. Daoust's assertion, this newspaper also reports in footnote the following excerpt of Dr. Masson's speech: "Le Dr. Masson déclare qu'il n'était pas en chambre lors de la passation de la loi seigneuriale, sans quoi il aurait voté contre. Je ne crois pas, dit-il, qu'aucune mesure ait été plus propre à ternir les annales de notre législation. Comme ministériel j'ai souvent voté avec le ministère en chambre, mais je puis dire qu'on ne pouvait pas voter une plus mauvaise loi, et je suis bien aisé d'avoir aujourd'hui l'occasion d'enregistrer mon protêt contre cette loi."
19. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
20. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
21. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
22. IBID.
23. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. Major differences exist between this report (footnotes 21 to 23) and GLOBE, 27 February 1856, which proposes the following version:  
"[Mr. C. Daoust:] ... Part of the scheme was that there was to be a fund, for the payment of the indemnities provided for by the Bill. Now what he wanted to know was whether there was any fund. That seemed very doubtful, for if there were, why were the Seigniors not paid for their lods et ventes, of which the payment by the censitaires had been stopped since the 1st of January.

"Mr. At. Gen. Drummond said that these interests were to be paid every six months, and of course none would be due till the expiration of six months from the time their lods et ventes were stopped.

"Mr. C. Daoust said, that at any rate it was an injustice to keep the Seigniors in the meantime without means. He did not certainly plead the cause of the Seigniors; but he wanted justice done to every body...."

24. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
25. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
26. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
27. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
28. IBID.
29. IBID.
30. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
31. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. GLOBE, 27 February 1856, reports Mr. Daoust "then concluded a speech of about an hour's length by moving the amendment".
32. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
33. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1 March 1856.
34. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
35. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, also reports that Mr. A. Cooke "parla si bas qu'il ne put être entendu."
36. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
37. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856, reports a slightly different version, as follows: "He further condemned the present establishment of the Culler's office in Quebec, as calculated to keep the centralised tyranny over the timber trade, and criticised the arrangements of Crown Lands Agencies in this part of the country, as exceedingly inconvenient for persons who had to go thence to Montreal to see the agents."
38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
39. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
40. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1 March 1856.
41. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
42. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
43. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
44. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
45. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
46. IBID.
47. IBID.
48. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
49. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
50. LE PAYS, 1 March 1856.
51. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
52. IBID.
53. IBID.
54. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. According to this report, Dr. Masson expressed these views after speaking of the Seigniorial Tenure Bill. The excerpt, however, was put at the end of the speech as it was difficult to insert it within the report from LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
55. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
56. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, specifies that "Mr. Chapais read from the Lower Canadian Educational Report to prove that the Common Schools of the Lower Province were in a flourishing condition. He proved also, by reference to authorities, that the higher educational systems were greatly in advance of those of the Upper Province."

57. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
58. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
59. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
60. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
61. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
62. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
63. IBID.
64. IBID.
65. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
66. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
67. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
68. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
69. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
70. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
71. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
72. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
73. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
74. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
75. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
76. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
77. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, reports the following comment: "M. Desaulniers n'a pas plus tôt repris sa place, que M. Loranger que la gauche croyait complètement terrassé par les arguments de poids du représentant de l'Assomption, se lève et donne le coup de grâce à l'amendement". Although Mr. Loranger spoke in English, several excerpts from La Minerve were used to reconstruct his speech as this newspaper offers a more substantial account.
78. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
79. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
80. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
81. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
82. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
83. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
84. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
85. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, also offers a slightly different version, as follows: "Enfin le bill fut envoyé de la Chambre au Conseil Législatif. Là il rencontra de nouveau le même mauvais vouloir qu'il avait essuyé la première fois, et lorsqu'il revint à la Chambre, j'allais dire qu'il se trouvait amendé mais comme ce mot donne l'idée d'amélioration, je préfère dire qu'il était altéré. Tel qu'il était pourtant, la Chambre crut devoir l'accepter. Il y avait déjà longtemps que cette question traînait en longueur et agitait le pays. Il fallait en finir et, tout en admettant que le bill aurait pu revenir en meilleure allure de sa visite au Conseil Législatif, on l'accueillit, ai-je dit, faute de mieux."
86. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
87. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
88. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
89. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
90. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
91. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
92. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
93. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
94. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
95. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.

96. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1 March 1856.
97. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
98. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
99. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
100. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
101. MORNING CHRONICLE, 1 March 1856.
102. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
103. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
104. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
105. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
106. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
107. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
108. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
109. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
110. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. From this point on, none of the newspapers reporting Mr. Loranger's speech respect the same order. The sequence reported by the Globe, which appears to be the most logical, was chosen to reconstruct this last segment.
111. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
112. IBID.
113. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
114. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
115. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
116. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
117. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
118. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, differs from this report when it specifies the decision was postponed due to the illness of "M. le juge Morin".
119. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
120. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
121. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, comments that Mr. Loranger "répéta contre ce journal toutes les injures qu'il a déjà publiées sous son nom dans la Minerve".
122. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
123. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
124. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
125. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, comments that Mr. Loranger "fit un discours aussi long que celui qu'il avait prononcé vendredi."
126. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
127. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
128. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
129. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
130. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
131. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
132. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
133. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
134. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
135. IBID.
136. IBID.
137. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, in its synopsis of debate, also reports the sum of \$1,800,000.
138. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
139. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.

140. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
141. IBID.
142. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
143. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
144. IBID.
145. IBID.
146. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
147. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
148. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
149. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
150. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
151. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
152. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
153. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
154. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
155. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
156. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
157. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
158. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
159. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
160. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
161. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
162. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
163. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
164. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856. This newspaper mistakenly reports Mr. Felton was referring to the Seigniorial Tenure Act. Comparison with other material proves he was still speaking of the Lower Canada Municipal Act.
165. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
166. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
167. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
168. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
169. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
170. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
171. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
172. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
173. IBID.
174. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
175. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
176. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. This report does not specify when exactly Mr. Sicotte called the gentleman to order. This interruption may therefore correspond to one of the unidentified cries of order reported in Mr. Pouliot's speech.
177. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
178. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. According to this report, Mr. Turcotte first called Mr. Pouliot to order for making remarks on Mr. Brown.
179. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
180. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
181. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
182. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
183. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
184. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
185. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
186. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
187. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.

188. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
189. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
190. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
191. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
192. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
193. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
194. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
195. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
196. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
197. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
198. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
199. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856, provides the exact figure of 2,000,000L for the value of the Ordnance Lands.
200. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
201. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
202. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
203. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
204. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
205. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
206. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
207. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.
208. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
209. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, adds the following information on Mr. Drummond's intended trip: "Il n'avait réellement pas eu le temps de le faire durant la dernière vacance. Au moment où il devait partir pour y aller, il avait été retenu par maladie pendant deux ou trois semaines."
210. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
211. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
212. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
213. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856. Several newspapers acknowledge the exceptional quality of Mr. Drummond's speech. For example, GLOBE, 27 February 1856, remarks that Mr. Drummond "delivered a mild and moderate speech, the only decent one which has been made by the ministry during the session." According to MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856, "he strove to speak courteously, to waste the time of the House with no flights of fancy, but to give his hearers as much information as possible." In WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, the correspondant writes: "This brought out a very Statesmanlike speech from Mr. Drummond, contrasting I am bound to say most favorably with all the rest of the speeches which were delivered during the debate--courteous and conciliatory in tone, it contained a candid and open explanation of all that had been done under the Seigniorial Tenure act, during the recess."
214. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856. In a commentary, HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856, reports the division was taken "after a lengthy discussion, principally confined to Lower Canadian Members." According to GLOBE, 27 February 1856, the amendment "was defeated by the usual Ministerial majority."
215. GLOBE, 1 March 1856, provides a commentary naming the Upper Canadian members, "Tories as well as Radicals," who voted for "this nefarious clause".
216. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
217. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
218. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
219. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
220. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
221. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.

- 222. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 223. IBID.
- 224. IBID.
- 225. IBID.
- 226. IBID.
- 227. IBID.
- 228. IBID.
- 229. IBID.
- 230. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
- 231. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 232. IBID.
- 233. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. According to LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, "M. McKenzie prononce un discours furibond contre la race canadienne qu'il représente comme une sangsue attachée aux flancs du peuple du Haut-Canada". WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, in a commentary, describes Mr. Mackenzie's speech as "a mere jumble of assertions thrown together pell-mell, without any agreement or leading idea to connect them save that they showed how Upper Canada was injured by the union. Some of these statements were histories of facts, which certainly should be studied carefully by all Upper Canadians.... On the other hand many were either false exaggerated or merely told the story of what had been done for Lower Canada, without rendering any account of the counterpart of expenses which had been incurred in Upper Canada."
- 234. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 235. IBID.
- 236. IBID.
- 237. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
- 238. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 239. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.
- 240. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 241. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 242. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 243. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 244. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 245. IBID.
- 246. IBID.
- 247. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 248. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 249. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 250. GLOBE, 1 March 1856, provides a commentary naming the Upper Canadian members who voted against the motion. It also states: "Seventeen members, all Upper Canadians, voted for the motion. This is a greater number than ever declared themselves in favor of the principle before. The minority will grow until it becomes a majority, and until it overwhelms all opposition." MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, also provides a long commentary, part of which reads as follows: "A vote was given which must convince every candid Upper Canadian that Upper Canada has now no refuge left but to agitate for a repeal of the Union; and show cause in England for its dissolution by the power which so arbitrarily created it.... Of 77 nays, 46 were from Lower Canada, and there were no Lower Canada yeas. Is not dissolution the remedy?"
- 251. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 252. IBID.
- 253. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 254. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.

- 255. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 256. IBID.
- 257. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 258. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, specifies Mr. Cameron "spoke at much length in defence of his political position."
- 259. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 260. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 261. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 262. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 263. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 264. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 265. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 266. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 267. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
- 268. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
- 269. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. Several newspapers reported commentaries regarding recriminations that took place in the House during the debate on the Address. In particular, the quarrel between Mr. Cameron and Mr. Holton rose objections from many newspapers of different political persuasions:

In MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856, the correspondant reports the following observations: "The debate grows more and more tedious--crimination is followed by recrimination; hard words are bandied across the House, and the country is paying over a hundred gentlemen six dollars a day for no better aim apparently than to enable them to blacken each other's characters, to ransack the past and pry into the future in a search after each other's faults and failings, and retail smart sayings at each other's expense. Really one gets disgusted sometimes with the freedom of speech enjoyed under our blessed constitution.... There are stray bits of valuable information--like those in the Attorney General's speech to-night,--and now and then a little statesmanlike appreciation of passing events; but the chief aim of every speaker seems to be to make some good points against his political adversary--not to develope any great principle, or honestly combat noxious political errors. Personal animosities are the staple of the discourse, the foundation of all the rest--the aim and object of the speech-making,--the higher, nobler attributes of statesmanship are treated as the mere accidental parts of the discourses." In MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856, the reporter adds: "Surely there must be something in the condition of the moon which makes men hasty just now and breeds quarrels. Scarcely had I closed my letter last night ... when the Hon. Mr. Cameron commenced a philippic against Mr. Holton of a very decidedly personally abusive character. Mr. Holton, as you are aware, had characterised the political conduct of the Hon. and learned member for Toronto as disreputable, because he afforded a general support to Ministers, but opposed them on certain questions on which his opposition could do them no harm.... Unfounded as Mr. Holton's accusation was, however, it was no sort of justification of Mr. Cameron's personal attack upon him, which was marked by excessively bad taste, and conceived in a quarrelsome, bullying spirit. The indirect appeal to the arbitrament of the pistol which he made, and which it pained me still more to hear Attorney-General Macdonald, and the Post Master General make later in the evening, is simply disgraceful to all of them. It was not very brave or chivalric either, even according to the notions of the admirers of the old code of honour to hint that one is a fire eater enough to fight it out, but that his adversary has placed himself in a position not to give nor receive miscalled 'gentlemanly' satisfaction. Bluster of this kind is very

safe. Such sort of thing is a relic of heathen barbarism of which men professing christianity and civilization should be ashamed."

TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, offers this point of view: "A few evenings ago, he [Mr. Holton] enunciated the correct doctrine that a member bound to a Government on test questions was committed to the whole of their policy. He made a special application of his proposition, and did so in terms the most inoffensive that could be conceived. How were his remarks received? Was his position controverted? Were his arguments refuted? Not in a single particular. A torrent of mere empty abuse, delivered with a melo dramatic affectation absolutely disgusting, was all the reply he received.... It has not been the custom of this journal to do inordinate homage to Mr. Holton. But we will say that his reply to the abuse of the younger member for Toronto was creditable to him in the highest degree both as a politician and as a gentleman. It had the recommendation of truthfulness--and a manly avowal of principle. It lacked the bluster and parade of his opponent. But in point of chastity and eloquence, it was as much superior to his assailant's as it is possible to conceive. It is not with less pleasure that we make these remarks, because Mr. Holton's politics are not ours. In questions of personal honor there are no political considerations. And we are glad to find men of all parties agreed in reprobating the political manoeuvres of which Mr. Holton's assailant has given us so notable an example."

LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, reports similar views in its commentary: "Quand les ministériels ne peuvent répondre à leurs accusations d'inconsistance ou de servilité politique, ils répondent par des injures ou par des accusations personnelles qu'ils savent parfaitement être fausses, mais qui tendent à incriminer le caractère privé de leurs adversaires si elles restent sans réponse. C'est ce que fit M. J.H. Cameron, ... en réponse à M. Holton.... Mais en supposant même que tout ce que disait M. Cameron fut vrai, était-il justifiable de venir ainsi accuser M. Holton en pleine chambre, sur des affaires purement personnelles et hors du contrôle de la chambre? Non, certes; et nous répudions hautement cette conduite; elle est une flétrissure non seulement pour ceux qui la tiennent, mais encore pour la chambre qui la permet."

270. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.

271. IBID.

272. IBID.

273. IBID.

274. IBID.

275. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.

276. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.

277. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856. WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, describes these as "other smaller amendments of no political importance". MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856, reports this final comment on the debate: "The result of the whole was immense majorities in favor of Ministers."

278. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 28 February 1856.

279. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856.

280. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856.

281. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856. This newspaper also remarks that Mr. Brown rose "after the House had been wearied past endurance by the long drawn out debate on the Address". Mr. Brown's speech generated a bitter debate, which many newspapers were quick to reprove in severe terms. The general feeling is well exemplified by DUNDAS TRIBUNE (reported in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), which describes it as "the most disgraceful scene that ever occurred in a Canadian Legislature".

This extremely vivid quarrel opposing Mr. Brown to Mr. J.A. Macdonald, Mr. Spence, and Mr. H. Smith, took place at such a late hour that most short-hand reporters, as well as many members, had already left the House. It also appears that the report of the event, as noted by GLOBE, 19 March 1856, was "evidently toned down". MONTREAL ARGUS (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), shares this view when it comments on the language used during the discussion: "No one can read it without disgust, even as it reads chastened and softened down by the reporters, who have, it would appear, more respect for the honor of the House, than have some of the members for their own reputation." It also seems possible that fatigue led reporters to omit certain speeches or expressions of a less "gentlemanlike" quality in the heat of the debate.

This debate was therefore reconstructed with the use of numerous incomplete reports. Aside from the two main sources (TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, and MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856), several short reports were resorted to, as well as commentaries whenever they provided factual information that could be inserted within the edited text. Although the reconstruction was done very carefully, the reader will note that it remains somewhat incomplete.

Throughout the country, an unusual number of newspapers commented on this "scene". Many of these commentaries are political analyses of the debate, but several provide interesting--and sometimes conflicting--information on the conduct of the chief actors during the debate. Many excerpts are therefore added in footnote to enrich and complement the verbatim reconstruction. A short selection of commentaries of a more general description is also attached to the closing footnote of the discussion, mainly to document the very strong reaction of the press towards the event. Finally, a list of the commentaries not quoted is provided for the reader's interest.

282. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
283. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
284. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
285. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
286. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
287. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
288. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
289. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
290. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, describes the scene that follows between Mr. Brown and Messrs. Spence and Macdonald, in these words: "Mr. Brown had not delivered many sentences, when he was interrupted in the most deliberate, determined manner by his two antagonists. They kept up for some time a continual shout--'It is not true--It is no true!' Mr. Brown kept his temper with wonderful equanimity, and continued his speech."
291. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
292. IBID.
293. IBID.
294. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
295. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
296. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
297. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
298. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
299. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
300. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
301. IBID.
302. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856. A short commentary from PERTH COURIER, 7 March 1856, implies that Mr. Macdonald repeatedly called Mr. Brown "a 'liar.' "

303. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
304. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
305. IBID.
306. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
307. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
308. IBID.
309. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
310. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
311. IBID.
312. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
313. IBID.
314. IBID.
315. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. This newspaper adds that Mr. Brown "continued his speech amidst the same constant interruptions, the Speaker finding it necessary to call the members of the Government three times to order within the space of a few minutes." No other newspaper reports these calls to order.
316. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
317. IBID.
318. IBID.
319. IBID.
320. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
321. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
322. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. This single verbatim statement does not seem sufficient to account for Mr. Cartier's actions throughout this debate. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, gives the following additional information: "Pendant toute cette scène..., M. Cartier se fit souvent remarquer par ses cris, ses éclats de rire et ses gestes insolents qui lui sont si familiers." MONTREAL ARGUS (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), further reports that Mr. Cartier was called to order by Mr. Sicotte during this debate.
323. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
324. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
325. IBID.
326. IBID.
327. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
328. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
329. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, offers a different version of these assertions: "He would briefly refer to a caucus which it was said had been held at the chambers of the senior member for Toronto, at which were present twelve leading men of the conservative party, whose opinion was that other element[s] were required in the present administration, who had been told by those members that there must be a change in their principles".

In a commentary, PERTH COURIER, 29 February 1856, provides the following information on this subject: "The Leader announces that a meeting of Conservative members was held last week at the office of John Hillyard Cameron, for the purpose of forming a distinct Conservative party under the Leadership of Mr. Cameron. About twelve attended the caucus and agreed to the proposal--among them, Messrs. Larwill, Murney, Powell, McCann, Yielding, Gamble, Shaw and W. Robinson. The party is not very strong, to be sure, but the secession of twelve from the Ministerial side, & thrown occasionally into the opposition vote, may, before the Session is over, cause a Ministerial defeat." WESTERN PLANET, 28 February 1856, also reports a commentary on Mr. Cameron's "separation from the ministry".

330. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
331. IBID.
332. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
333. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
334. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. Although this newspaper imputes this comment to Mr. McCann, it is questionable whether that member really interfered in the debate. Firstly, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, reports a similar statement, but omits the name of the member who spoke: "The hon. member hear (sic) rose to a point of order; the hon. gentleman, the member for Toronto, was not present in his place; and it was very unfair; it was not right that such observations should be permitted in his absence." Secondly, Mr. Brown's reply to this remark does not appear relevant to Mr. McCann. Mr. Brown seems to address a member who has just taken his seat in the House, but Mr. McCann as well as the other members whose involvement in the debate was reported by newspapers, were all present at the opening of the Session.
335. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
336. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
337. IBID.
338. IBID.
339. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
340. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
341. IBID.
342. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. This action is faultily imputed to "the hon. member for Hamilton"--Mr. MacNab--who was then absent from the House. Since the following footnote clarifies the mistake by reporting Mr. Spence replied to "the hon. member for Haldimand", we inserted Mr. Mackenzie's name.
343. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. The ellipsis represents an illegible word.
344. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
345. IBID.
346. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
347. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. The ellipsis represents an illegible word.
348. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
349. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
350. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
351. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
352. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
353. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
354. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
355. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. To contradict Mr. Spence's assertions, and support Mr. Brown's accusations against that gentleman, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, provides in a commentary, two excerpts of the Dundas Warder signed by Mr. Spence, the second presumably dated 22 August, 1854.
356. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
357. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
358. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. According to LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, "M. Spence répondit à M. Brown avec beaucoup d'excitation et nia emphatiquement plusieurs faits avancés par M. Brown." GLOBE, 27 February 1856, reports that Mr. Spence "spoke at great length", and GLOBE, 28 February 1856, that he spoke "in the most offensive strain".
359. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
360. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.

361. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
362. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
363. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
364. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
365. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
366. IBID.
367. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.
368. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
369. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
370. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, also comments: "This capped the climax, and the Postmaster-General appeared to be silenced."
371. GLOBE, 27 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, in a commentary, confirms this statement: "There is no doubt that Mr. Macdonald rose to address the House on Tuesday night under feelings of great excitement."
372. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
373. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
374. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. This footnote concludes the report in this newspaper.
375. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
376. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
377. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
378. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
379. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
380. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
381. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. GLOBE, 7 March 1856, provides the following commentary: "It is much to be regretted that the attack of the Attorney General was made at so late an hour in the night, that all the short-hand reporters had left the gallery, with one exception--and that that one should have caught so imperfectly the language used." Several other newspapers reported commentaries describing the language and attitude adopted by Mr. J.A. Macdonald during his speech. The following are of a particular interest:

GLOBE, 27 February 1856, reports the following comment: "Description would fail us to convey an idea of the ferocious language employed by the learned gentleman. He absolutely raved. He deluged the honourable member for Lambton with a torrent of abuse which would have made the oldest habitus of Billingsgate stand aghast." GLOBE, 28 February 1856, further adds: "The Attorney General rose and poured out a volley of abusive epithets, which we verily believe was never heard before in any legislative body. Members stood aghast at the foul words which escaped his lips; even the French priest men ceased their usual shout...; the Speaker called him constantly to order; but, overlooking all obstacles, he hurried on to make the charge which he had evidently prepared as a finishing stroke for Mr. Brown." PERTH COURIER, 7 March 1856, also comments: "Mr. Macdonald was repeatedly called to order by the Speaker, but he heeded it not." These are the only reports affirming Mr. J.A. Macdonald was called to order while he was preferring his charges.

WESTERN PLANET, 6 March 1856, reports this point of view: "Mr. Brown's condemnation of his [Mr. Macdonald's] political tergiversation roused him to his feet in a foaming rage, and led him to indulge in a strain of personal invective and abuse, which has no parallel in any British House of Legislation." According to CANADA CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), "the Attorney General for Canada West, made use of the most abusive language, and applied the most opprobrious epithets to his political opponent, Mr. Brown; and, while boiling with rage, hinted in pretty strong terms that he would like

to shoot him down. The conduct of Mr. McDonald was of such a disgraceful nature as to unfit him for a seat in the Legislature".

382. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856.

383. IBID.

384. IBID.

385. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856. GLOBE, 27 February 1856, reports Mr. Smith "rose in a violent rage and roared across the table the most insulting language at Mr. Brown."

386. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856.

387. IBID.

388. IBID.

389. IBID.

390. IBID.

391. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, reports the charges were made at about three in the morning.

392. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. According to WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, Mr. J.A. Macdonald's accusations "produced a perfect storm of passion in the House, which lasted till the adjournment."

393. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. In a commentary, DUNDAS TRIBUNE (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), describes the scene, as follows: "The conduct of Ministers while their colleague was charging Mr. Brown with these serious crimes was most abusive. It was evident they wanted to goad him into some act of personal violence. They failed, however, most signally. The honorable gentleman, conscious of his innocence, behaved under this foul torrent of abuse with most admirable coolness." Other newspapers share this point of view. For example, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, contends that Mr. H. Smith and Mr. J.A. Macdonald were "both ... apparently desirous to provoke Mr. Brown to some act of personal violence". The reporter then adds: "When I say that Mr. Brown's conduct was cool, cautious, and manly, no one who has read my free strictures on his political career will suppose I exaggerate." GLOBE, 28 February 1856, similarly comments: "During the whole scene, Mr. Brown, while repelling with spirit the charges made against him, never lost his temper, and never used an unparliamentary word."

394. GLOBE, 27 February 1856.

395. DUNDAS TRIBUNE (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856).

396. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.

397. IBID.

398. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. In its synopsis of debate, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, reports the discussion "lasted till half-past three this morning." LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, concurs with this information.

The following excerpts of commentaries were chosen as they propose a comprehensive analysis of the debate. They also show the wide spectrum of point of views that are expressed by newspapers of different political persuasions:

MONTREAL ARGUS (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), offers the following summary of the discussion: "The Debate on the answer to the Address to the Governor's Speech just terminated, if not unparalleled in duration, is certainly so in vituperation. And no one on reading it can deny from which side of the House the whole amount of vulgar personal abuse exclusively issued. Not one member of the opposition was called to order for a breach of decorum, or of those ordinary rules of courtesy which gentlemen understand and practise. Out of the members of the Administration no less than four,--Messrs. MacDonald, Spence, Cartier, and H. Smith, were called to order--some of them repeatedly--by the Speaker.... In short, the speeches of the Ministry, with few exceptions were

characterised with the grossest vulgarity, and were utterly unsuited to an assembly of Legislators, where wisdom and propriety ought alike to preside.... For two hours, we learn, was the Legislative Hall made the arena of altercation in which such epithets as 'liar,' 'scoundrel,' 'convicted liar' poured forth from the mouths of Ministers of State, directed against a political opponent who was at the time performing a high public duty, in a constitutional (sic) manner, and in strictly Parliamentary form." WOODSTOCK SENTINEL (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), concurs with this opinion and states: "It is true that Mr. Brown taunted the Attorney General West with having obtained his election on false pretences.... Was Mr. Brown, then transgressing the limits of Parliamentary debate? Assuredly not." MONTREAL WITNESS (in GLOBE, 19 March 1856), offers the following comment: "Mr. Brown, as his manner is, made a very slashing onslaught on different members of the ministry, and charged them with forsaking their principles for the sake of office; but, judging from the fact, that he was never once called to order by the Speaker, as well as from the reports of the speech itself, I certainly believe he never transgressed the bounds of parliamentary decorum. The charges he preferred may be correct or they may not, but they were made fairly.... But I regret to say they were met far otherwise, and by their bearing that night, some Ministers disgraced themselves, and brought disgrace upon their country. One by one, the members attacked lost their temper, interrupted their opponent--threw the lie direct in his teeth, were called to order by the Speaker,--and then, instead of replying to the charges, burst out into violent invectives totally irrelevant". DUNDAS TRIBUNE and WELLAND HERALD (both in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), also severely criticize the action of the Ministers involved in the debate.

HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856, offers a different point of view, entirely blaming Mr. Brown for the event: "The hon. gentleman created a 'scene,' in which, as a matter of course, he was badly treated, at least so says his organ." MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856, shares this opinion when it states: "Not content, however, with a simple defence which was all that at that hour he should have entered upon, he could not refrain from 'carrying the war into Africa.' " TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, also comments: "It is not that we differ politically from Mr. Brown, that we censure his revival of the whole personalities of the debate at its very close--but because he must have foreseen that the result could not be creditable to our Parliamentary discussions."

GALT REFORMER (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), in a statement strongly in favor of Mr. Brown, attempts to explain the situation which led to the debate. It states: "All who have studied the proceedings of Parliament, must know that the member for Lambton has been the most dreaded opponent of the Coalition on the Opposition benches. His eloquent speech on the address, made ministers tremble for their seats, and his telling exposures of their corruption and treachery, from the formation of the administration up to the present time, brought the blush of shame, and aroused a storm of indignation which ministers only awaited an opportunity to pour on the head of the fearless advocate of Upper Canadian interests. Nearly every day brought additional exposures, and it soon became evident that unless the member for Lambton could be silenced, the Coalition must soon go to the wall. Ministers seem to have thought that to destroy his character was their only hope of continuing the support of their Reform adherents, and seem to have entered into one of the most deep and diabolical conspiracies to forever ruin a political opponent, which the annals of Legislation ever presented. The Coalition in their eagerness to ruin Mr. Brown's character, not only as a public man but as a christian, have stopt

at nothing, and the Attorney-General West has just made charges against that hon. member sufficient to send him to the Penitentiary for life.... We may well ask, on viewing the conduct of the Ministry on this matter, the insulting language used--and the many times members of the Cabinet trampled upon the rules of the House--if the days of Family compactism are not returning."

Finally, most newspapers commented severally on the spirit shown in the House since the opening of the Session. As expressed by CANADA CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), "the press of all shades of politics condemn in unmeasured terms the personal attacks which have been made night after night." TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, writes: "What we condemn is, that the dignity of the House should be so far lowered by recrimination, which merely ends in awakening the bitterest personal animosity between public men." In another column, this newspaper adds: "We question much, whether the scenes which were witnessed in the House of Assembly on Wednesday morning will tend greatly to enhance the respectability of the present Parliament. It is noticeable that the debate on the last ten days, with the exception of Mr. Drummond's speech has been almost exclusively personal. And the conclusion of the discussion was greatly in character with the whole tone of the proceedings.... We are no advocates of duelling. But what is to become of the thing we call personal honor, if men holding the highest position in the country are to call each other liars, scoundrels, and villains, and no account is to be made of it? We hold, that if these terms can be used freely without risk of incurring personal chastisement, we must soon become a community of poltroons and cowards". WESTERN PLANET, 6 March 1856, offers the following opinion: "That the leader of a Government should under any circumstances give vent to such an ebullition of passion, and use expressions that would disgrace the vilest Billingsgate fishmonger, as did the Hon. J.A. McDonald towards Mr. Brown, argues little either for the self-respect of the man who could utter them, or the dignity of the House, that would tolerate such a departure from Parliamentary courtesy. If we are to take the scene of the other night as a specimen, Parliamentary phras[e]ology is nothing more nor less than personal vituperation and slander, regardless alike of the civilities and decencies of the social state." Also, WOODSTOCK SPIRIT OF THE TIMES (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), specifically states: "We are no admirers of Mr. Brown's political policy. Far from it. Still less are we disposed to allow to pass in silence and unreprieved what we can see to be an insult to the respectability of the assembly and the country."

Other commentaries can be found in: QUEBEC GAZETTE, 4 March 1856; HASTINGS CHRONICLE, BOWMANVILLE STATESMAN, ST. CATHARINES POST, STRATFORD BEACON, LONDON FREE PRESS, KENT ADVERTISER, PETERBORO' DISPATCH, BRANTFORD EXPOSITOR, HAMILTON BANNER, and COBOURG SUN (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856); MONTREAL HERALD, MONTREAL ARGUS, and HURON SIGNAL (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856).

399. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.

400. According to GLOBE, 27 February 1856, "the House then broke up in great excitement." LE PAYS, 6 March 1856, reports similar information.

Newspapers which report the hour of adjournment greatly conflict with each other. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, mistakenly reports the House adjourned "shortly after two o'clock", while TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, reports it adjourned at "half-past three o'clock". However, assuming that the last debate of this day may have ended at half-past three, as TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 27 February 1856, reports in its synopsis of debate, and since the House still had business to do on the Address, it is more likely it sat "until near four o'clock", as reported by HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.

WEDNESDAY, 27 FEBRUARY 1856.

(60)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Frazer,--The Petition of Peter Gibbons and others, Creditors of the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway Company; the Petition of William Hampton, senior, and others, of the Township of Crowland; and the Petition of the Provisional Municipal Council of the County of Welland.

By Mr. Munro,--The Petition of Robert Cathcart and others, of the Township of Clarke.

By Mr. Huot,--The Petition of Benjamin Vohl and others, of the Parish of Ancienne Lorette, County of Quebec<sup>1</sup>; and the Petition of the Municipal Council of the Parish of St. Etienne de la Malbaie, County of Charlevoix.

By the Honorable Mr. Cauchon,--The Petition of the Reverend L. Provancher, Curé, and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of St. Tite des Caps, County of Montmorency; and the Petition of La Communauté des Révérend[e]s Soeurs de la Charité de l'Hôpital Général de Bytown.

By the Honorable Mr. Robinson,--The Petition of Henry Augustine Fitzgerald McLeod, of the City of London, County of Middlesex, Civil Engineer; and the Petition of William Leonard, late School Master in the Town of New Carlisle, County of Bonaventure.

By Mr. Freeman,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Binbrook.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of Thomas Parke, of Port Colborne.

By Mr. Matheson,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Oxford.

By Mr. Scatcherd,--The Petition of Charles Powell and others, of the Township of Delaware; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Delaware.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of George Samuel Wilkes, of the Town of Brantford; and the Petition of J.A. Wilkes and others, of the County of Brant; and the Petition of John H. Moore and others, of Brantford.

By Mr. Brown,--The Petition of R.A. Chute and others, of the Township of Bosanquet and vicinity; the Petition of James Steward, of the City of Hamilton, Ironfounder; and the Petition of J.B. Mowat and others, of the Town of Niagara.

By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of Gilbert Paten and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Louis Card and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Philinda Peters and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; the Petition of Edwin C. Packard and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; the Petition of John N. Wilson and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; and the Petition of William Weller, of the Town of Cobourg, and others.

By the Honorable Mr. Cameron,--The Petition of James Cockburn and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; and the Petition of Geoffry Hawkins, of the City of Toronto, Gentleman.

By Mr. Foley,--The Petition of George Hughes and others, of the Township of Wellesl[e]y, in the County of Waterloo; and the Petition of P.C. Vanbrocklin, of the Town of Brantford, County of Brant, on behalf of himself and others.

By Mr. Shaw,--The Petition of Causland Bothwell and others, of the Township of Drummond, County of Lanark.

By Mr. Hartman,--The Petition of John Hunt and others, of the Township of King.

(61)

By Mr. Evanturel,--The Petition of the Roman Catholic Institute of St. Rochs, Quebec; the Petition of the Reverend F. Boucher, Curé, and others, of the Parish

of St. Ambroise de la Jeune Lorette; and the Petition of the Asylum of the Good Shepherd of Quebec.

By Mr. Poulin,--The Petition of the Corporation of the College of Monnoir, County of Rowville; and the Petition of the Reverend J.A. Provincal, Curé of St. Césaire, District of Montreal.

By Mr. Angus Morrison,--The Petition of Henry Spencer Papps, of the City of Hamilton.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of Ira Schofield, late a Captain in the 2nd Regiment of Leeds Militia, during the War of 1812; and the Petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo.

By the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald,--The Petition of James Alexander Henderson and others, of the City of Kingston, Members of the Freemasons' Hall Association; and the Petition of Benjamin Walker, of the City of Toronto, Gentleman.

Pursuant to the Order of the Day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of the Reverend J.R. Paré, Curé of the Parish of St. Jacques, County of Montcalm; praying aid for a Superior School in the said Parish.

Of Peter Skelly and others, of Rawdon, and other Townships, County of Montcalm; and of the Reverend J. Perrault and others, of the Parish of St. Jacques de l'Achigan, County of Montcalm; praying for certain amendments to the Act to incorporate the L'Assomption River and Railway Company.

Of the Reverend M. Carrier, Curé, and others, School Commissioners of the Parish of St. Antoine de la Baie; praying aid for a Superior School in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend L.T. Fortier and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of the Parish of St. Jean Baptiste de Nicolet; praying aid for a Female Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend Narcisse Pelletier, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St. Eusèbe de Stanfold, County of Arthabaska; praying aid for a Female Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend L.T. Fortier and others, of the Parish of St. Jean Baptiste de Nicolet; praying aid for the construction of a Female Educational Establishment in the said Parish.

Of Sister Jauron, Superior, and others, Sisters of Charity, in charge of the Hotel Dieu Hospital of St. Hyacinthe; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend A. Théberge, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Terrebonne; praying that the Parish of Terrebonne may be annexed to the County of Laval.

Of John Leslie and James Leslie, of the Township of Godmanchester; praying compensation for damage done to their property by the rising of the water on Lake St. Francis, caused by the dam erected at the head of the Beauharnois Canal.

Of the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company to lease or sell their Road.

Of W.W. Colburn and others, of the Town of Brockville; of James Gibb and others, of the City of Quebec; and of John Dodsworth and others, of the City of London, Canada West; praying for the passing of an Act for the encouragement of Horticulture.

Of Robert H. Barlow, late of Blackheath, London, England, now of Brantford, in the Province of Canada, on behalf of himself and others; and of J. Mackirdy and others, holders of Mortgage Bonds of the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway

(62)

Company; praying for the passing [of] an Act to incorporate the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway Company.

Of David Burritt; praying that a certain Road allowance, between Lots numbers twenty-four and twenty-five in the broken front first Concession of the Township of Marlborough may be vested in him.

Of the Town Council of the Town of Prescott; praying for aid for the Ottawa and Prescott Railway Company.

Of William Mountain, of the Town of Sorel; praying indemnification for loss sustained by the burning of his Grist Mill, by Incendiaries, while he was on duty during the Rebellion of 1837.

Of Michael Mernagh, Master Builder and Contractor, of the City of Quebec; praying for payment of his account for work done by order of the Select Committee appointed to adopt means for the better ventilation of the Music Hall, then occupied for the sittings of the Legislative Assembly.

Of the Corporation of the Clercs de St. Viateur of L'Industrie; praying for aid.

Of Alfred Faulkenburg, Merchant, of the City of Quebec; praying to be naturalized.

Of the Reverend J.E.D. Dupuis, Curé, and of the Reverend A.T. Lacoursiere, Vicaire, of the Parish of Ste. Anne de la Pérade, District of Three Rivers; praying for aid to enable them to make certain necessary repairs to the School House, in the said Parish.

Of Peter Carroll and others, of the City of Hamilton; praying for the passing of an Act to enable them to carry on the business of Banking under the name of "The Union Bank of Canada."

Of the Reverend F.P. Porlier, Curé, and others, Church Wardens and others, of the Parish of Pointe aux Trembles, District of Montreal; praying for an Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend F.P. Porlier, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Pointe aux Trembles, District of Montreal; praying for aid in support of the School under the care of the Sisters of the Congregation of the said parish.

Of E.L. Hurley and others, of the Village of Wilton, County of Addington; of David Morgan and others, of the Township of Townsend, County of Norfolk; of the Municipality of the Township of Emily, County of Victoria; of Richard Thompson and others, of the Township of Hope; and of E. Peters and others, of the Township of Hope; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of Norbert Bourassa, Mayor, and others, of Point Levi; praying that Clergymen, Priests and Doctors, when in discharge of their respective callings to the sick, and that children on their way to school, may be exempted from paying toll, at the several toll gates in the said Parish.

Of the College of De Notre Dame de la Victoire, County of Levi, District of Quebec; praying for aid.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Wainfleet; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company to lease their Road; and also for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.

Of the Bank of Montreal; praying for the passing of an Act to consolidate and amend the several Acts relating to the said Bank.

Of the Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the City of Montreal; praying that the Bill passed during last Session "to amend the provisions of the several Acts for the Incorporation of the City of Montreal," may be repealed.

Of the Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the City of Montreal; praying for aid to establish and sustain Houses of Industry and Reformation, on a scale commensurate with the wants of the said City.

(63)

*Of the Montreal Board of Trade; praying that means may be adopted to construct a Line of Telegraph from Quebec to Forteau Bay.*

*Of Ezra Bray and others, of School Section No. 15, Trafalgar, County of Halton; praying that a certain portion of the original allowance for Road, not required for public use, may be vested in them, on which to erect a School House.*

*Of the Library Association and Mechanics' Institute of the Town of Sorel; praying for aid.*

*Of the Quebec Protestant Female Orphan Asylum; praying for aid.*

*Of the Quebec Board of Trade; praying that the [Act] 10 & 11 Vic. cap. 25, establishing a Shipping Master's Office at the Port of Quebec, may be repealed.*

*Of Louis Edouard Pacaud, Advocate, of the Town of Three Rivers; praying indemnity for his services as Commissioner of Bankrupts for Three Rivers, from 21st April, 1844, to the 16th August, 1847.*

*Of the London Mercantile Library Association; praying for aid.*

*Of the Reverend J. Gastineau, Curé of St. Eustache, and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of St. Eustache, County of Two Mountains; praying for aid for the erection of a College in the Village of St. Eustache.*

*On motion of the Honorable Mr. Cameron, seconded by Mr. Wright,*

*Ordered, That the Select Committee on the Argenteuil Election Petition have leave to adjourn until Monday next, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, in order to afford time to the Petitioner and Sitting Member to examine the evidence taken under the Commission.*

*Ordered, That the Petition of Gédéon Brien dit Desrochers and others, of the Townships of Kilkenny and Wexford, County of Montcalm; the Petition of Michael Mernagh, Master Builder and Contractor, of the City of Quebec; and the Petition of the Montreal Board of Trade, relative to a line of Telegraph from Quebec to Georgian Bay (sic)<sup>2</sup>, be severally printed, for the use of the Members of this House.*

[On motion of] MR. YOUNG, seconded by MR. HOLTON,<sup>3</sup>

(63)

*Ordered, That the Public Accounts, for the year 1854, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.*

*Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the said Committee to inquire into and report from time to time, any measures which in their judgment may appear to be calculated to introduce a greater degree of economy in Public expenditure, and an improvement in the system of Accounts.*

MR. S. SMITH of Northumberland, asked leave to introduce a bill to vest in Samuel Doolittle and Robert Johns[t]on the allowance for road between Lots No. 14 and 15, in broken front, Concession A, township of [Haldimand, County of] Northumberland.<sup>4</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER objected on the ground that it was contrary to the rules of the House to introduce a bill into the House, without giving two days' notice of so doing.<sup>5</sup>

A short debate arose on this subject, in which MR. S. SMITH, MR. J.S. MACDONALD, MR. GALT, MR. CAMERON, and MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND took part.<sup>6</sup>

The matter ended by ... [MR. S. SMITH] giving notice of his bill which was then read a first time<sup>7</sup>.

(63)

*Ordered, That Mr. Sidney Smith have leave to bring in a Bill to vest in Ephraim Doolittle and Robert Johnston a certain allowance for Road, in the Township of Haldimand.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time, on Friday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion have leave to bring in a Bill to incorporate the Society called "The Union of St. Joseph of Montreal."*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time, on Monday next.*

MR. BROWN rose, and said--I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I shall have the indulgence of the House while I allude, as I feel bound to do, to the painful scene which occurred here last night. (Loud cries of Hear, hear.) I am sure we must all feel humiliated by the language which was used in this House last night. I speak not only of the words applied to myself, but to other members of this House: for I am sure we must all feel that it would be far better if such language could be banished from this House altogether. But there was, last night, a much more serious matter than the mere use of language of a painful and disagreeable character. There was an accusation brought against me personally, by an hon. member of this House, a gentleman holding a high position in the Government of the country, which, if it were true, would at once pronounce me unworthy of a seat in this House<sup>8</sup>--or the respect or confidence of the public.<sup>9</sup> And I am sure that every hon. member will feel that if I were to sit here silent under the accusation made publicly by the Attorney General, that very fact would of itself pronounce me unworthy of a seat in this House.<sup>10</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>11</sup> I shall not now reflect upon the circumstances under which the charge was brought by the hon. gentleman--although I think I would be justified in saying something in regard to that--for it is a most extraordinary thing that such a charge should be brought up after the lapse of eight years, especially considering that during a large portion of that time I had been on terms of personal friendship with the Atty. Gen., and had received his hospitality, and that of several of his present colleagues. I say, Sir, it is an unheard-of thing that such a charge should have been bottled up since 1851, and only discharged at me at the conclusion of such a debate as we have had--that it was only when his Government were having the worst of the argument, and were hard beset, that the last gentleman allowed himself to make that serious charge. I cannot permit those expressions to pass under the plea that they escaped from the hon. gentleman in the heat and the excitement of debate. The accusation is not only not true and cannot be sustained, but there is not the shadow of a foundation for it, and I defy him to establish it. I take the hon. gentleman at his word. He said that if he had a committee of this House, he would prove the charges he made--and now I stand up here to call upon him to take that course, and to establish his charges. (Cheers.) I throw on him the onus of establishing them, or of standing convicted of wilful and deliberate slander. I, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker--

"That it be resolved that the Hon. John A. Macdonald, Attorney-General for Upper Canada, having, in the course of debate last evening, charged Mr. George Brown, a member of this House, while acting, in 1848, as a member and secretary of the Commission appointed by Government to inquire into the condition of the Provincial Penitentiary--

"1. With having recorded, falsely, the evidence of witnesses examined before the said Commission.

"2. With having altered the written testimony given by witnesses, after their evidence was closed and subscribed.

"3. With having suborned convicts to commit perjury.

"4. With having obtained the pardon of murderers confined in the Penitentiary, to induce them to give false evidence, or in words substantially to the same effect.

"And the said Hon. John A. Macdonald, having pledged himself to substantiate these charges, that a Committee of seven members be appointed to enquire and report, with all convenient speed, as to the truth of the said charges, with power to send for persons and papers."

It may appear extraordinary, continued Mr. Brown, that I should move for such a committee as this. And perhaps, if the accusation had not been brought so unexpectedly, and if I had not been called upon to reply at the moment, I might, instead of saying that I would move for a committee myself, have called upon the hon. gentleman to move for it. That perhaps would have been the best course; and hon. gentlemen may look upon it as an extraordinary thing that a man should move for a committee to enquire into accusations against him, which, if one-fifth of them were true, should have sent him to the Penitentiary. But I felt that this was a matter which could no longer be allowed to remain over. The hon. gentleman once brought certain charges before, and they were then refuted in the most ample manner, but now that they are reiterated in a new shape it is time they were brought to a final issue. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen opposite shall have the appointment of the committee, and if, on the fullest enquiry, they can show the slightest shadow of a shade of truth to sustain the charges, I shall be content to be condemned by this House and by the country. (Hear, hear.) I shall not attempt to prejudice the House by giving a statement of the extraordinary circumstances which attended the commission to which these charges had reference; but as many hon. members are not aware of the manner in which all this has arisen, I shall state briefly, without attempting to excite any feeling what took place in regard to it. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the Provincial Penitentiary was established in 1833 or 1834. In 1847, when the Conservative Government were in power, charges of gross cruelty, and great impropriety in the management of the Institution, were publicly made, and were also addressed to the Government. They determined to institute an enquiry, and a commission was prepared, which was found in the office of the Provincial Secretary, when the Conservative Government went out, and the Baldwin-Lafontaine Administration came in. The new Administration took up the matter, and proceeded to appoint a commission, not for the purpose, as was stated, of trying Mr. Smith, the father of the present Solicitor-General, and Warden of the Penitentiary,--but for the purpose of enquiring into the condition of that Institution, reporting on its finances, and devising an improved system of prison discipline. As members of that Commission were appointed the Hon. Adam Fergusson, a gentleman than whom no man stands higher in the estimation of the public, Sheriff Thomas, a man of high integrity, Mr. Bristow and Mr. Amiot also gentlemen of high integrity, and myself. In addition to being a member of the commission, I was appointed Secretary, and had a great deal of the labour of it.<sup>12</sup> We ... knew nothing at all about the charges preferred against the Institution.<sup>13</sup> The Government having handed over to us certain papers, certain complaints as to the management of the Institution, we proceeded to Kingston, sent for the Warden and I[n]spectors of the Penitentiary, and stated the course we intended to pursue. They expressed their perfect satisfaction with that course. A minute of it was written down, and the assent of those gentlemen was obtained to it. There may be a question raised as to the propriety of our course on some points, as, for instance, in regard to our refusing to permit the employment of counsel. Different opinions may be held as to that; although I am prepared to meet any member of this House on every one of those points, and to show that the conclusion which all five

of the Commissioners arrived at<sup>14</sup> after fully and impartially weighing the evidence<sup>15</sup> was the only prudent one, the only way in which we could discharge the trust committed to us. We went on, and continued our proceedings for a long period of time. We found that out of 130,000L of the public money that had been spent, there were not proper vouchers for 10,000L of it. We found (sic) in one year 2,200 instances of corporal punishment--that on an average every man, woman, and child in the Penitentiary had been stripped and lashed four times. We found that abuses of the grossest description existed in the Institution, and we made what may be called a clean sweep of it, so far as we were concerned,<sup>16</sup> and urged on the Government the necessity of an entire change in the Institution. The Government, accordingly appointed Commissioners to superintend the affairs of the Institution, of whom he (Mr. B.) was one.<sup>17</sup> It is true, and I am proud to say it, that we had the courage to act with a firm hand in the administration of the affairs of the Institution. My colleagues and I conducted it for a period of three years without remuneration. In many instances we acted in a very summary manner, but I am prepared to justify every part of our course, and to show that it was not only firm, but prudent and successful. In the first year we reduced the number of corporal punishments from 2,200 to the nominal figure of, I think, 11. We reduced the expenses also, which the previous three years averaged \$65,000 annually to \$40,000 the first year, \$30,000 the next, and \$20,000 the next. Had we remained a little longer, I believe we would have made it self-sustaining. (Hear, hear.) If these are points on which an argument can be raised, we are prepared to justify our course, and to prove that we were right in every step we took. But there are points, Mr. Speaker, on which there can be no mistake, and these are the points charged by the Attorney General. He charges that I recorded falsely the evidence of witnesses--he charges me with having added to the written testimony of witnesses--he charges me with having suborned convicts to commit perjury--and he charges me with having obtained the pardon of murderers confined in the Penitentiary, as an inducement to give false evidence.<sup>18</sup> Were not such accusations sufficient to rouse one's temper?<sup>19</sup> Now there is no mistake about all this. There is no question to be raised upon it. It is utterly false. From beginning to end, there is not a shadow of truth in it.<sup>20</sup> In fact, the circumstances under which the evidence was taken showed it to be utterly impossible that such a charge could be true. The Commission was composed of five gentlemen, whose characters were as irreproachable, and whose position in life was as honorable, as that of any hon. gentleman opposite.<sup>21</sup> There was not one single act, not a single word written, not a single thing done, that there was not a quorum of three present, who recorded their sanction of everything that took place. I was well aware when I undertook the duty, of the painful character of the circumstances I would be placed in; and before the thing went far, I was made aware of the sort of reproaches I would be exposed to for doing my duty to my country. But I took care that if any such charges should ever be made, I would be able to refute them thoroughly. Every witness examined was brought in before at least three, and generally before all five of us. Nothing was ever done that was not written down and agreed upon by every one present. A witness was sworn, and the questions put to him in writing--then his answer was taken and written down and read to him, to see if it were correct--then the next question and answer in the same way. And after it was all through, I read over to each witness the whole evidence from beginning to end, and said--Is that correct? If he said he had any doubt, we altered it. If he said it was all right, then we asked Mr. Smith, the Warden, who was present when every witness was examined, and heard every word, and took notes of every word--we asked Mr. Smith if he was satisfied, and if not the point was discussed, and the witness asked about the correctness of it, until it suited his views. And never was a witness allowed to leave, until he had admitted, and the Warden had admitted, that every word was taken

down correctly. And then I sat down and wrote--"the foregoing evidence having been read over, the witness declared it to be correct, and Mr. Warden Smith declared himself satisfied"--and the witness signed it. And besides, there is not one single deposition or one word of evidence that has not the chairman's name attached to it.<sup>22</sup>

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria,) interrupted Mr. Brown to say that the hon. gentleman ought to know that before the committee asked for by him had been granted, the government would have to give their consent to its appointment. If they did intend doing so, the course pursued by the hon. gentleman was most extraordinary, in going into the defence before the committee had even been named. If the government had refused to consent to the appointment of the committee, then indeed there might be some reason why the hon. gentleman should enter into his defence. As it was, it was most extraordinary that he should do so at this juncture.<sup>23</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a specimen of the treatment which this side of the House is constantly receiving at the hands of the Government. (Hear, hear.) I have been charged with falsifying evidence and suborning murderers--the charges brought against me will be sent abroad through the country with the Attorney General's name attached to them, and will be carried to the United States and to England--yet the hon. gentleman would stop me when I ask to be permitted to explain. (Hear, hear.) Was not the Hon. Attorney General allowed to give his statement of the facts last night, and when I rose to reply, did not you, Mr. Speaker, ask me to defer making any statement till another occasion, and did I not bow to your decision? And now that hon. gentleman who is always ready to get up and do the mean work of gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, must try, forsooth, to silence me on a matter like this<sup>24</sup>--and let such calumnies go unrefuted!<sup>25</sup> It is in keeping, however, with the courtesy which we have received all through. And it is a specimen, I suppose, of the courtesy we may expect to receive during the whole session. But we have one satisfaction, that the country will not feel so.<sup>26</sup>

Hear, hear, from the opposition.<sup>27</sup>

[MR. BROWN:] The country will feel that, placed on my defence as I am, it would require a word which I shall not use to characterize aright the conduct of the hon. gentleman who rose to interrupt me. (Cheers.) Perhaps, knowing the character of the witnesses that will be called, and knowing the character of the evidence on record before the Penitentiary Commission, I should have asked such a tribunal as would have put the witnesses on oath. And were it not for the perfect purity of my cause, and that I know that my honor cannot be tarnished, I would not submit to be tried by a Committee on the evidence of such witnesses as may be brought forward<sup>28</sup> [OR] as he (Mr. McD.) had brought forward to sustain a charge on a subsequent occasion.<sup>29</sup> But feeling that there is not a shadow of truth in it--that the whole charge, from beginning to end, is the result of malice--and that I can defy the honorable gentleman in the slightest degree to substantiate it, I ask for the committee, and shall allow the Government to place such members upon it as they choose. Is it not most humiliating to us as Canadians, that such a scene as was witnessed last night, should have occurred? It is most humiliating that it could really be supposed possible that I could have been guilty of such things--that I could possibly have been capable of recording testimony falsely--that I could have been capable of adding to the written testimony of persons after the evidence was closed--that I could possibly have been capable of suborning convicts to commit perjury--that I could possibly have sought the pardon of a murderer confined in the Penitentiary to

induce him to give false evidence--that after all that, I should have been a member of this House during two Parliaments, and enjoyed in some measure the confidence of the public during this time, and that the very gentleman who brings those charges, should himself have been on good personal terms with me. It is a most humiliating supposition that that hon. gentleman and his friends, could have so disgraced themselves as to be on terms of friendship with a man whom they considered capable of such criminal conduct. (Hear, hear.) And besides, that hon. gentleman has occupied a high position in the government, and has for two years had the power to try me for those offences, which if proved, should have driven me out of this House. That he had that power, and yet that he kept the charge to be brought forward, when it suited him to use it as a political weapon, is a fact most humiliating to our country, and this I am sure, will be the feeling of every man who has its highest interests at heart. (Cheers.) Mr. Brown concluded by moving the resolution given above.<sup>30</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD rose and said, the hon. member for Lambton had stated his surprise at a certain expression which fell from his friend the hon. member for Victoria.<sup>31</sup> I must say I do not participate in that surprise; nor do I think that the suggestion made by my hon. friend was out of place. When in the heat of the debate--and, I must say, the unfortunate debate which took place last night--I made use of certain language, it was in the option of the hon. gentleman then to have replied to it--or, in consequence of the lateness of the night and the excited state of the House, to have made his statement to-day, and allowed both statements to go to the country together. But the hon. gentleman having demanded a Committee of Enquiry, the whole matter should have been left to that Committee. I expected that he would demand that Committee; but he has gone further, and made his defence before the Committee is actually appointed<sup>32</sup>--in order to prejudge the case in the opinion of the country.<sup>33</sup> The hon. gentleman states that he is surprised the charges should have been reserved for eight years, till they could be conveniently used as a political shot. I think, when I state the facts, the House will see that they were not so reserved.<sup>34</sup> The origin of his (Mr. McD.'s) connection with this matter was simply this. In 1849 he (Attorney General) had represented Kingston. In that year this Committee was appointed to examine into the management of the Penitentiary. Mr. Smith, the Warden of the Penitentiary--an old friend of his (Attorney General's), and also one of his constituents--considered himself aggrieved by the report of the Commission--whether rightly or wrongly, he (Attorney General) could not tell. He (Mr. Smith,) conceiving himself fully entitled to common justice--determined on petitioning the government against the decision of the Commissioners<sup>35</sup>, but the government supported the Commissioners as a matter of course<sup>36</sup>; and he then prepared a petition to this House, and placed it in my hands. I, as representing him, did not take charge of the petition on his ipse dixit alone, but took measures to verify some of the charges, by receiving viva voce evidence from several respectable witnesses, in proof of some, if not of the whole, of his allegations. I do not remember now the details, but they were very much to the effect of the statements that I made last night.<sup>37</sup> He [Mr. Macdonald] came to Parliament in 1849 or 1850, presented this petition and moved the appointment of a special committee to inquire into the conduct of the Penitentiary Commission (sic), by which, Mr. Smith alleged, he had been unjustly treated. Then was the first occasion on which he made those statements; and any honorable gentlemen present on that occasion would remember that his (Attorney General's) language was then quite as strong as that which he had used on the preceding night. The honorable member for Lambton, too, heard what he (Attorney General) said eight years ago, in moving for the select committee, and also when he subsequently renewed the application. On the

last occasion Mr. Smith again got up a petition, renewing all his former allegations, which petition he (Attorney General) laid before the House. He then pressed on the House that Mr. Smith was entitled to that meed of justice now demanded by the member for Lambton. But his application was again refused by the Government of the day, at the special instance of the hon. member for Lambton. This had been denied by that gentleman last night<sup>38</sup>, and the Attorney General had no proof at hand of the allegations, though he had the statements of no less than three members of the Government to that effect, none of them now members of that House<sup>39</sup>. That hon. gentleman then asserted that he had never interfered in the slightest degree on the occasion referred to; and that it would be remembered that he had never even prompted the Administration to refuse the Committee. But he (Attorney General) was well aware that such was not the case. He then sat over on the Opposition benches, and Mr. Brown occupied a seat in the Reporters' gallery. On that night he (Attorney General) saw Mr. Brown speaking to Mr. Richards, who co[n]ducted the case on behalf of the Government,<sup>40</sup> and though he could not hear the words uttered, his manner showed he was remonstrating against the appointment of a committee.<sup>41</sup> Other members of the House also saw him communicate with Mr. Richards, and heard what he then said. But it really looked like something providential, when an hon. gentleman of that House<sup>42</sup> (Mr. Casault)<sup>43</sup>, who sat next Mr. Brown on that night, in the Reporters' gallery, was able to state thst (sic) he then heard Mr. Richards advise Mr. Brown to yield to the Committee, and heard him, in reply, saying he refused to do so. What, he would ask, could any person think of Mr. B's conduct on that occasion? What could any dispassionate person think on hearing charges then made--made, too, in language so plain, strong and precise as to be unmistakable--(for if he remembered rightly he had the petition in his hand, while speaking on that occasion)--what, he would ask, could any dispassionate person think when the Government on that occasion refused the commission of enquiry asked for--refused to allow him an opportunity of proving the truth of the allegations he advanced? What were these charges which he then urged?<sup>44</sup> That, if it was thought from old age or incompetency, or want of temper or any other cause the Institution suffered from his remaining at its head, it was competent for the Government to remove Mr. Smith at once and without assigning any reason<sup>45</sup>. But when the Commission charged him with fraud, larceny and embezzlement, and, in short, of every crime of the meanest and most sordid nature--and pronounced him guilty of several of these charges--he stated that all he wanted was that this committee should be appointed to fully investigate the facts of the case, in order that his character should be cleared of the slanders thrown on it. As for the office, he was willing that should go. But when his personal character was assailed,--when he had no means of redress, except through that house--and when there was no other means of forcing Mr. Brown, who was, in fact, the Commission, to give proof of the charge of which Mr. Smith was found guilty--when he had no means of retirieving (sic) his maligned character except by an appeal to that house--on two separate occasions, Mr. Smith was refused justice by the Government, and that, too, at the instigation of Mr. Brown. What, then, could he think but that he (Mr. B.) was afraid of the investigation? Persons could not avoid coming to the conclusion that Mr. Brown was anxious to prevent Mr. Smith's statement from being submitted to the committee. There was, indeed, no other conclusion to be arrived at. Under those circumstances<sup>46</sup> I think, Mr. Speaker, that I was quite justified in stating last night, as I had done before, that if that opportunity was given, I could bring forward the statements which had been made to me on the subject. (Ironical cries of Hear, hear.) Of course I have no personal knowledge of the transactions. I could not be present. The doors were locked and old Mr. Smith had neither counsel nor audience to check the proceedings. I agree in the statements which have been made as to the respectability of the Commissioners, or most of them, but you

will remember that Mr. Brown was the Secretary, the managing man, and the quorum was always changing, and was never the same for more than three or four or five or six weeks together. They came and relieved each other, and Mr. Brown had the sole charge of the documents, which were in his own hand-writing. He was the amanuensis, and did everything. He consulted the others, it is true, but he himself kept the thread of the story from beginning to end.<sup>47</sup> Hence, when one set of Commissioners went out, the others could only learn what happened from the information which Mr. Brown chose to supply them with. So that, in fact, the whole case depended on Mr. Brown.<sup>48</sup> Mr. Speaker, the strongest proof that the Government were not satisfied with the Report of the Commissioners was, that they never confirmed it, and a member of the Administration told me that they advisedly declined to confirm it. (Cries of Name! Name!) He told me that Mr. Brown had never forgiven him for it. They expressed no opinion as to the merits or demerits of Mr. Smith, and declined confirming the Report, but they did not think it for the interests of the Institution to restore Mr. Smith to his office. And to show that they did [not] think him criminal, whatever they might have thought of his competency, they came down and put in the estimate the arrears of his salary for one or two years.<sup>49</sup>

MR. MURNEY.--I beg to ask, was not Mr. Smith dismissed?<sup>50</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH.--He was dismissed before he was tried.<sup>51</sup>

MR. BROWN.--He was suspended first, and dismissed afterwards.<sup>52</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--He was dismissed before the Report was made.<sup>53</sup>

MR. BROWN.--That is a mistake. Not only was he dismissed by the Government on the Report, but they allowed him to put in piles of letters and additional counter-evidence, and dismissed him upon that.<sup>54</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--I cannot now repeat the particular words of the communication, in which Mr. Smith was informed, that he would not be restored to the Wardenship of the Penitentiary, but he was suspended by the Commissioners, removed from his official residence, and expelled [from] the grounds and buildings, and the government taking all things into consideration did not think it proper to restore him but declined to express any opinion as to his criminality or innocence. The language I used last night, was used under great excitement, but excitement caused I must say, without again entering into the debate, by my conceiving myself to be grievously wronged and maligned by the hon. gentleman. My feelings were so wounded by attacks made by him, strongly going to my own dishonour, that I considered myself justified in repeating what I had not hesitated to repeat before, on the responsibility of myself as a member of Parliament, in the face of this House and of the country. The hon. gentleman has put a ... motion into your hands. That motion I cannot agree to, as he has put it. I cannot agree to the wording of it, to the expressions he puts in as the words I used. All the gentlemen present can show what the words were. The true way is, that the same Committee be struck as I asked for eight years ago, to make the same investigation into the conduct of the hon. gentleman. (Ironical cries of hear, hear.) Let that Committee be appointed now, and it will be for the hon. gentleman to call witnesses, or I will call witnesses, to prove what I said, and then let it investigate into the conduct of Mr. Brown on that Commission. The hon. gentleman should not, I think, say in that resolution, what were the words I used--(Oh! oh!) Let the hon. member for Lambton call the honourable member for Glengarry and others on his side, and I will call gentlemen on this side,

to state their recollection of what were the exact words I used, and then it will be for me to go on to show whether the statements I made were false or true. I can call witnesses who told me they could prove--<sup>55</sup>

[Cries of] Oh! oh!<sup>56</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD:] Do hon. gentlemen suppose that I can be a witness myself? I hope, through the instrumentality of the friends of the hon. gentleman, it will be agreed, that the Committee shall enquire into and put on paper the statements I made, and then we shall go into the evidence, and I will have an opportunity either of proving or of failing to prove, that the statements I made are correct.<sup>57</sup> He had reason to believe that that hon. gentleman's attack, on the previous evening, was only part of a series of attacks which he had instituted to defame and insult him (Attorney General.) On every occasion, that hon. gentleman had taken occasion to [do] him deep, grievous (sic) and manifest wrong in the eyes of the public; and last night's attack was, he believed, but a continuation of the same system.<sup>58</sup>

MR. LORANGER said, that since the hon. member for Lambton had asked for a Committee, he thought that Committee should be granted him. (Hear, hear.) He regretted that such occurrences should take place in the House, as they must end, not only in throwing disgrace on some particular member, but in lowering the dignity of ... the whole House. (Hear, hear.) The charges against the hon. member for Lambton were extremely grave<sup>59</sup>. Such charges should not be rashly made; if made they should be maintained; if found true<sup>60</sup>, the consequences would be heavy on that hon. gentleman--if found untrue, the consequences would be very heavy on his accusers. (Hear, hear.) As a member of the House, and one who had at heart its dignity and independence, he regretted the necessity which had arisen<sup>61</sup>. He thought it ... an inconvenient course to appoint a Committee to enquire into matters so long past<sup>62</sup>, but there was no other alternative than to grant the Committee which had been asked for. (Hear, hear.)<sup>63</sup>

MR. MURNEY said he should vote for the motion of the hon. member for Lambton. He considered it a most extraordinary thing that a gentleman in the position (sic) of the Attorney-General, having had in his pockets for years back, as he said, letters affecting the character of a member of the House, should still have continued to associate with him both in the house and out of the house, on terms of intimate friendship. (Hear, hear.)<sup>64</sup> If true, he was bound in the public interest to have presented these charges long ago.<sup>65</sup> The government were bound to grant the committee, as the hon. member for Lambton's character was assailed in such an unwonted manner.<sup>66</sup> But he did not think the Committee would do anything. The Government would have the nomination and control of this Committee, and if the member for Lambton's character was at stake, so was the Attorney General's, and the Government would take good care that the Attorney-General was protected by their majority.<sup>67</sup>

Hear, hear, and cries of order from the Ministerial side.<sup>68</sup>

[MR. MURNEY] added that before the doors were opened, he had addressed the Speaker on a point of order, which was, that the Government being the guardians of the privileges of the House, hon. members should not at least be insulted at their hands. (Hear, hear.)<sup>69</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) said it would have been well, had the Attorney General last night addressed the House in the cool manner he had done to-day. The scene that took place last night or rather this morning was such as called for the

reprobation of any hon. member who had any regard to the dignity of the House. (Hear, hear.) The accusations no doubt were made under a state of great excitement caused by the slashing charge of his hon. friend from Lambton, which was of a political character, and not affecting personal honour. The Attorney General and his colleagues felt the force of that charge, and it excited them to bring against his hon. friend an accusation of the gravest nature, which involved his character, not merely as a public man, but as a private citizen.<sup>70</sup> [He] was astonished the Government should hesitate to grant a committee to investigate the charges which had been laid against the hon. member for Lambton. He said that something should be done in order to clear the character of the hon. member for Lambton (sic). The Attorney General has stated that he was prepared to prove those charges, and that he had witnesses who were also prepared to prove the charges that were made against the hon. member for Lambton. If so, the hon. member for Lambton had no other alternative but to demand a committee of enquiry into his conduct, as the charges which had been made against him last night had gone through the country. The House must also try these charges for its own honor.<sup>71</sup> If the hon. member was guilty of a tithe of what had been laid to his charge, he was unfit longer to hold his seat there. The house owed it to itself to expel him.<sup>72</sup> The Attorney General had to-day very considerably shifted his ground. (Hear, hear.) He desired the enquiry to be now in regard to the charges against Mr. Smith. (Hear, hear.) Last night the charges were made in such vehement language as excited the anger of many hon. members on that side of the House, and his hon. friend feeling that he could not remain under such charges, and that something was necessary to purge him from them, called on him (Mr. McD.) and all the other members surrounding his desk, to take down the words. (Hear, hear.) And it would not do for the hon. gentleman now to qualify the language he made use of, which was taken down at the time.<sup>73</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--I neither admit nor deny the words imputed to me in the resolution, but I say the fairest way is to let the committee, who are to try the statement, ascertain what they were.<sup>74</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) said, there could be no question as to what was the language made use of. But the hon. gentleman attempted to make out now that he was not bound to prove the charges, but that he would simply bring people who had told him so and so. Last night, he said he could prove them; but now he did not wish to be understood as meaning that he pledged himself to establish them. (Hear, hear.) Last night, he charged his hon. friend with serious crimes. Now, he tried to shift the enquiry, by making it an enquiry into the conduct of the Commission. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney-General had taken it upon himself to charge his hon. friend with these crimes<sup>75</sup>. What, he would ask, would be the position of the hon. member, if the committee were refused, now that the charge had gone abroad through the world?<sup>76</sup> If the Committee he asked for was refused, the country would judge of the position of the minority in this House, when a member on that side, so accused, was refused a fair trial. (Hear, hear.) The Attorney-General said, let a Committee be appointed to find out what were the words he used last night. He did not understand him to say that he did not utter those words, or that he did not mean them. Could any hon. gentleman in this House deny that those were the words? (Hear, hear.) Then, why should the Attorney-General object to his hon. friend's resolution? (Hear, hear.) His honorable friend knew well that the position he had taken up in this House had brought down upon him the ire and the anathemas of many honourable members whose conduct as public men he had been obliged to comment (sic) upon in no measured terms, with that force and ability which were peculiar to him.--But, notwithstanding that the position he had taken up had laid him open to attacks of

every description, now when, to cap the climax, charges were made which, if true, would send him into disgrace, he was quite willing to accept a Committee not named by himself. When charges were brought against the late Administration<sup>77</sup> by the Attorney General,<sup>78</sup> Sir Allan MacNab gave notice that he would move a Committee of Enquiry, and Solicitor General Smith afterwards moved it, and wished even to name the Committee. How much more necessary was it, when the charges were of the nature that had been brought against his hon'ble friend for Lambton? He called, then, upon the House not to confirm the ungenerous conduct of charging his hon. friend with serious crimes, and then doing him the injustice of refusing him a fair enquiry. (Hear, hear.)<sup>79</sup>

MR. POWELL was exceedingly gratified that the expression of opinion had been so general from all the members on both sides of the house who had spoken, in deprecating such scenes as occurred last night.<sup>80</sup> He had frequently felt that such scenes as he had witnessed night after night in Quebec, were not such as to raise the character of the house in the eyes of the country. He regretted that he could not argue with the hon. member for Glengary as to the leg[i]timacy of the course he wished to pursue, but thought it desirable that it should be ascertained clearly and fairly, the language used by the Attorney General, before proceeding to appoint a committee to examine into the charges.<sup>81</sup> He did not admire either the tone or the language of the member for Hastings (Mr. Murney.) That hon. member had no right to say that if the House selected the Committee, it would be a packed committee on account of the Government having a majority in the house, and the hon. member for Lambton being in a minority, or that on that account justice would not be done between the parties.<sup>82</sup> He regretted such language from the mouth of any hon. member, more especially when that hon. member might be called upon himself to act as a judge in this matter. The Attorney General had undoubtedly reason to feel very keenly the assaults made against him by the hon. member for Lambton through his paper.<sup>83</sup> There was hardly any public man, however high in the estimation of the country, who had not felt his [Mr. Brown's] attacks. It was only lately that the Attorney General had been charged, in the columns of a paper which the hon. member for Lambton controlled, with crime amounting to perjury<sup>84</sup> (order, order).<sup>85</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said if the hon. member was allowed to proceed with such remarks, hon. gentlemen will have equal liberty to reply, and much discussion would result. But if the hon. gentleman would confine himself to the question before the House, more justice would be done to it.<sup>86</sup>

MR. POWELL regretted that he had been led away in his remarks. He only wished to say that if hon. gentlemen, possessing the confidence of the Crown and the country, were made the target of such abuse as was given last night, it would be an inducement for every hon. gentleman to court obscurity, rather than to take part in the business of the country.<sup>87</sup> It was not surprising that members--who had been made the targets for the slanders of others, either making them on the floor of that House or through the columns of a newspaper--lost patience, and that such scenes as they all deplore should follow.<sup>88</sup> He was in favour of granting the Committee, for he agreed with the member for Laprairie (Mr. Loranger) that it was not right that the Attorney General should make such charges, and afterwards evade the responsibility of having made them. (Hear, hear.)<sup>89</sup> It was due to the position of the hon. member for Lambton that it should be granted, in order that he may be relieved from such charges if innocent, or if guilty, that he may stand the consequences of them.<sup>90</sup>

MR. WILSON shared in the regret which had been expressed at the occurrence of the scene of last night. The Attorney General said he had asked twice before for a Committee substantially the same as that now sought, and he understood from his remarks that, having taken for granted that the charges were true from the unwillingness of the hon. (sic) member to allow the Committee, he was emboldened to make them again last night, but he objected to the Committee being granted in the mode sought by the member for Lambton. He [Mr. J.A. Macdonald] wished the committee to be charged with a further enquiry into what was the language made use of by ... himself. Now the House could not misunderstand what the charges were, it was not a question of words, but of facts. (Loud cries of hear, hear.)<sup>91</sup> As to the precise nature of the language, there might be some dispute; but<sup>92</sup> it was no matter whether the charges were made in calm or in excited language, there was no misunderstanding what the charges themselves were. (Hear, hear.) The House was aware that the member for Lambton was one of the Commissioners of Enquiry into the affairs of the Provincial Penitentiary, and in addition to that he allowed himself to be put into what was perha[p]s the false position of acting as Secretary too. At all events he did act as Secretary, and now he was distinctly charged with falsifying evidence--there could be no misunderstanding. Did he do it or did he not? That was the question, and not as to the particular language in which the Attorney General conveyed the charge. (Hear, hear.)<sup>93</sup> Did the Attorney General charge the member for Lambton with falsifying the evidence? No one he supposed would deny that. The hon. member for Lambton says it is not true, and asks for a committee to enquire into it. Did the hon. member add to the testimony which had been written down in the presence of the witnesses? There can be no misunderstanding of this. It is said that a murder[er] was suborned in order to give evidence, and either before or after giving his testimony he was reprieved. Is that true or false?<sup>94</sup> And so with all the other charges. And if the member for Lambton was guilty in regard to any one of them, the House must feel that he was unworthy to hold a seat in it, or to hold up his head in society anywhere. He could not therefore see how the House could (sic) refuse the hon. member the Committee he asked for, especially if it was substantially the same as had been asked for by the Attorney General on former occasions. (Hear, hear.) Surely it was not to be tolerated that the Attorney General should charge another hon. member with grave crimes, and that that other should sit under that accusation, without a fair opportunity being given him of having a full enquiry made into the truth of the charges. No one who had respect for himself or for the honour of the House, would refuse the Committee, and no hon. member should be allowed to evade it by raising a question of words. (Hear, hear.)<sup>95</sup> In justice to both parties--in justice to the House, it should be given--for no one will believe that the Attorney General made these charges without being prepared to prove them.<sup>96</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY wished to correct a misapprehension into which hon. members had fallen, as if this House refused to grant a committee. He thought the House would not hesitate a moment in granting a committee. The difference lies simply in this, that hon. gentlemen on this side think that committees should first ascertain the precise nature of the charges, and then go into the truth or falsity of them. He felt that every hon. member aggrieved had a right to come to this House, and demand a committee<sup>97</sup>, but [he] would move an amendment to refer the charges generally, without binding the Committee down to the precise words stated in Mr. Brown's motion.<sup>98</sup> As to the scene of last night he only echoed the sentiments of every one around him, when he said they all regretted the heat, the excitement, and the loss of temper, which had been witnessed; and perhaps none would regret it more than those who had used expressions not customary among gentlemen. He thought

there would be no attempt to justify those expressions; nor, at the same time, would there be any attempt to shirk sustaining the charges which had been brought. He begged to move, in amendment--

"That it be resolved, that a Committee of seven members be appointed to enquire into and report with all convenient speed as to the nature of the charges made by the Hon. Attorney General Macdonald against Mr. George Brown, a member of this House, and as to their truth, and that this Committee be struck to-morrow."

He thought it as reasonable that Mr. Macdonald should dictate the words he used, as that Mr. Brown should do so. They had a copy on that side also of the language as taken down at the time. (Cries of "Read it.") No! He would not read it. That would be taking himself the same course which he condemned in others.--(Oh! oh!)<sup>99</sup> [He] would leave the committee to investigate into the precise words.<sup>100</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH seconded the amendment.<sup>101</sup>

MR. WILSON wished to offer a suggestion. If the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite was taken advisedly, he had nothing to say, but he did think it strange to leave a Jury as it were to ascertain what the charge was. (Hear, hear.)<sup>102</sup>

MR. RANKIN said he had hoped his honorable friend the Inspector General had risen for the purpose of announcing that it was the intention of the Government, with that frankness and sense of justice and liberality which he would fain see characterize their conduct on all occasions--that it was their intention to comply with the request of the member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.) He was really quite astonished that there could be one moment's hesitation on the part of any one in this House, in regard to granting the investigation sought. It was a matter of little consequence what was the precise language used, but it was a matter of material moment whether the charges, whatever might have been the language which conveyed them, were themselves true? (Hear, hear.) He considered it was just as necessary that the Attorney General should make good his words, if he was to be permitted to retain the position he now occupied, as it was necessary for the member for Lambton to have an opportunity of rebutting the charges, for the vindication of his own character. (Hear, hear.)<sup>103</sup> He condemned, in severe terms, the manner in which personalities had been indulged in--to such an extent that it really became a questionable honor for men who respected themselves to hold a seat there. They were not sent there to fritter away their time in personal disputes. They ought to settle them elsewhere. He hoped this would be the last they would hear of this affair.<sup>104</sup>

MR. J. SMITH, (Victoria), vindicated (sic) his interruption of the member for Lambton in the remarks he thought it necessary to address the House, and endeavoured also to sustain the course of the Attorney General in charging the committee with an enquiry as to the particular words used.<sup>105</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--I cannot see why the Attorney General should have any hesitation whatever in granting the committee, in the very words of the resolution that the hon. member for Lambton has moved. If the Attorney General charges me with falsifying evidence, with suborning persons to give false testimony, with getting the pardon of a convict, whether a murderer or not, for the purpose of getting from him evidence to suit me--if he makes those charges, I do not think the particular language in which he makes them is a matter of any sort of importance. (Hear, hear.) If I were to be a member of that committee, and if it were proved that the member

for Lambton had endeavoured to obtain the pardon of a person put into the Penitentiary for larceny, in order to induce him to give evidence, do you think I would acquit him because it was said in the charge that the person had been put in for murder? (Hear, hear.) Would any one dream of defending himself on a quibble of that sort in a matter affecting his character and personal honour? (Hear, hear.) Even if stronger language is put into the Attorney General's mouth than he actually used, I cannot see why, if he made the charges, he should refuse to grant the committee. I cannot lay it to the charge of the Hon. Attorney General that he has placed himself in the position of an accuser in the way of making statements as of his own personal knowledge. He is not to be the witness himself--the knowledge he has, he has obtained from others. But the responsibility rests just as strongly on him, as if he had offered to be his own witness, if he does not bring forward (sic) other witnesses who can prove what he has stated. (Hear, hear.)<sup>106</sup> He believed his hon. friend would not have made the charges if he had not been prepared to prove them.<sup>107</sup> And, when he has reiterated the statement, as to the substance of the thing, before the House again to-day, common justice demands at our hands that the accused party should be allowed every latitude in defending himself that the rules of the House can afford him. (Hear, hear.) I do not think the member for Lambton would have risked so strong a statement as that there was not the shadow of a shade of foundation for the charges, unless he could justify it. And I would therefore ask the Attorney General not to throw any difficulty, or to allow it to be said that any difficulty had been thrown in the way of a full investigation being obtained by the hon. member for Lambton. (Hear, hear.)<sup>108</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY.--I rise to order. We throw no difficulty.<sup>109</sup> This House was prepared to vindicate its own honor.<sup>110</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--I did not intend in any way to assume that the Government were to throw difficulty in the way of a committee which at the commencement they stated they were to grant--but why throw difficulty in the way of the manner in which it shall be granted? (Hear, hear.) Why should it enquire first into what the Attorney General said, and then into the truth of the charges?<sup>111</sup> He thought it unreasonable to ask hon. members who, like himself, were absent, to allege by resolution what the Atty. General had said. They might as well declare the member for Lambton guilty. That was to be ascertained by evidence...; between half and three quarters of the members of the House were absent at the time: how could they pass a resolution reciting the words made use of.<sup>112</sup> Could it be supposed that the Committee was to be bound down by words? And if the Attorney General feels that the charges can be proved in substance, this House would be wanting in respect for its own dignity and rights, if there should be any hesitation on our part about granting the Committee. (Hear, hear.) Therefore I desire that no amendment should be offered, but that the resolution originally put should be at once and unanimously adopted by the House. (Hear, hear.)<sup>113</sup>

Six o'clock having arrived, MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair<sup>114</sup> [and] the House adjourned for an hour and a half. After the recess<sup>115</sup>,

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND rose to repudiate the slightest intention to refuse the hon. member for Lambton the appointment of a Committee to investigate the charges made against him.<sup>116</sup> [He] said that there was no man in the House that regretted more than he did the charges that were brought last night against the hon. member for Lambton. He had read statements in the press of the Province--some of these

organs being controlled by men that were sent here to legislate for the cauntry (sic), which he would be sorry if any member on his side of the House would imitate.<sup>117</sup> He believed in the principle that there can be no good where there is no charity; where legislation is not founded on charity, that legislation cannot be good; where it is founded on jealousy and uncharitableness it must be productive of evil. It is unworthy of men sent here to legislate for the good of the country, to spend the time of the House in mutual recriminations. True, attacks of a most gross character had been made upon those public men who have been placed at the head of affairs. Every man in such a position must enwrap himself in a coat of mail and let the dogs bark away at their (sic) heels.<sup>118</sup> The legislators of this Province would not show themselves worthy of their positions, if they did not pluck from their breasts all personalities, and who would stoop to what the Opposition were guilty of.<sup>119</sup> If the hon. member for Lambton has no connection with a certain newspaper, in which every species of accusation has been brought against the members of the late and present Ministries, then these remarks are not applicable to him. He wished not to make a personal application. He desired that all on both sides of the House should learn from the events of last night.<sup>120</sup> He remembered how strongly accusations had been blurted against an hon. gentleman who had occupied a high position in the confidence of his fellow-citizens. The member for Lambton felt the bitter pangs of those personal attacks which he had not hesitated to hurl against others. A lesson might be learned from the occasion. It was most desirable that personal attacks should be avoided. He felt, however, that the hon. member for Lambton had been guilty of making very serious charges against hon. members on his (Mr. D's.) side of the House.<sup>121</sup> The hon. member for Lambton, in answering the speeches in which his name had been mentioned, had made accusations against the honourable Post Master General, which that gentleman considered untrue; was it wonderful, then, that the hon. Postmaster General, who is not yet steeled as he (Attorney General Drummond) is against attacks of every description, should feel deeply at hearing his conduct misrepresented, and should be tempted to speak too strongly.--Again, if his hon. friend, the Attorney General, felt that accusations of the most unjust character had been made against him, is it any wonder that he should be tempted to use language, which all deeply regretted. He mentioned these things to extenuate the course which the hon. Attorney General thought fit to adopt. He (Attorney General Drummond) would have wished, that events of the past had not been raked up--that the Penitentiary Commission matters had been allowed to sleep.<sup>122</sup> Members of this House should not look at one another with envy. Gentlemen of both sides of the House should forget all past difficulties; and support such measures as they believed to be conducive to the interests of the country. For God's sake, let hon. members of this House forget the past<sup>123</sup>, except to draw therefrom lessons of wisdom. He wished them to be applied to themselves by gentlemen on both sides of the House. He always endeavoured to refrain from reverting to the past.<sup>124</sup> No one in the House ever heard him go into personalities. No one in the House would throw obstructions in the way of the getting of the committee that was asked for.<sup>125</sup> He would not refuse to give the hon. member for Lambton the fullest scope in the investigation he had asked for, and in any way, with the exception, that the Attorney General should have an opportunity of explaining to this House, what he really did say, what differences he considers to exist between the words in the motion of the hon. member for Lambton, and those which he (Attorney General Macdonald) considers he used. Both gentlemen, it is to be remembered, are to be on their trial.... The same justice, therefore, should be extended to the hon. Attorney General, as to the hon. member for Lambton.<sup>126</sup> If the charges were proved, the hon. member for Lambton should resign his seat; if the charges were not proved, the Attorney General would stand in a very equivocal position. Both parties were, therefore,

greatly involved--and each should have an equal privilege of stating before the House the precise character of the charges.<sup>127</sup> He (Mr. Attorney General Drummond) believed, that the words used in the motion before the House, expressed fairly the substance of what was said by Attorney General Macdonald; but the words of that motion should not be considered as tying down the committee asked for, or confining their action.<sup>128</sup> How could the gentlemen that were not in the House last night say what had taken place, or what were the words that had been used? Lest it should be said that we were trying to pass over the matter, every enquiry should be made into the charges by a committee. He sincerely hoped that this would be the last of such actions, and that the members of this house would turn from accusing each other of vile motives in their actions. He called no man a traitor that held different opinions to him, as to how the administration of the country should be carried out. But he did call that man a traitor who is determined to uphold a system and enforce it for the purpose of grasping power himself, and of calumniating every man that had contrary views to his own, and who stood in the way of his self-aggrandisement. Such a man would find that truth was the great principle with the people. He might succeed in sweeping ministers from power, and casting a cloud over them; but such deeds would have their own rewards, and the slanderer would be punished.<sup>129</sup> He [Mr. Drummond] wanted men of broad views, and men who would base all legislation upon charity.<sup>130</sup> He would again ask the House would it not be pardonable if the hon. Attorney General, in answer to charges affecting this House, answered with a good deal of warmth; if an hon. member were accused of perjury, would it be wondered at if he spoke warmly? Yet such was the case in this instance. The hon. Attorney General was accused of things as bad as these, and surely it was not to be wondered at that he spoke in his own defence. As to accusations against himself and those that accused him, he would say that he would send the gentlemen a good steel file to file off the sharpness of their teeth.<sup>131</sup> This much he said in extenuation of Attorney General Macdonald's conduct, and he hoped that no further recrimination would be indulged in, but that the House would turn to the serious business before them.<sup>132</sup>

MR. CAMERON said he had no doubt if the hon. member for Lambton would agree to a few words being added to his motion, he trusted that the Inspector General would withdraw his amendment. He would wish the words added to the motion, "or in words substantially to the same effect."<sup>133</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said he had no objection to the committee, but he did not wish to be tied down to the precise words in the resolution, which he had no hand in writing, or was even asked whether he had used the words or no. If the House did not tie him down to the very words in the resolution, but simply the substance of them, he had not the slightest hesitation in agreeing with the committee. He had no recollection of using the words "adding to the testimony of the witnesses." His words were, he thought, that all the testimony was altered. If these words were struck out, he had no objection at all to the committee.<sup>134</sup>

MR. TURCOTTE said he agreed to the motion before the House, but he<sup>135</sup> doubted the legality of the proceedings. He did not think that it was competent for Parliament to try a case of forgery, or subornation of witnesses. He was well aware that men would endeavor to do their duty, but it could not but be seen that parties were already divided.<sup>136</sup> This was not a Court for such purposes. Men could not divest themselves of all prejudices, and act coolly in a matter of this kind. Latent passions will lie in men's breasts, even contrary to their own wishes. A sense of justice would compel him to vote for the motion, though he thought he was wrong in

doing so<sup>137</sup>; the precedent was a most dangerous one and if followed up might lead to great difficulty. The course, he thought, would have been for the Speaker to have compelled the Attorney General to retract the words as unparliamentary.<sup>138</sup> Who can enforce the sentence that may be pronounced against either party? No one. The gentlemen may laugh at any decision come to, and take their seats again in this House. The hon. Attorney General spoke not from his own knowledge, but from hearsay; and when he comes to sift the matter he may find that his information was incorrect and could not be proved. Attorney General Macdonald should apologise--this would be more noble--members of the Ministry were in a position to be taunted, and should be able to keep their temper. When they failed to do so, they should be the first to say they were wrong. If they had acted so, there would not be a member in the House who would pronounce the hon. member for Lambton guilty. He knew another member of the House against whom similar charges might be made. He (Mr. Turcotte) might be tempted to say so, and then another investigation would take place, another trial would ensue. This, if proceeded with, will be a celebrated case in Canada. He was proud that neither party belonged to the inferior race.<sup>139</sup>

MR. FERRES regretted the position in which the House was about to place itself.<sup>140</sup> [He] asked if it were because hasty words had passed in debate, that the House were to take them up, and make them the subject of formal investigation. There were at present no charges on record, and would it be wise of the house to place them on record.<sup>141</sup>

A member said the Attorney General had placed them there himself.<sup>142</sup>

MR. FERRES said that at present no one knew the truth or otherwise of the charge which had been made. There were only forty members present at the time, and who would say that the words framed in the resolution were the precise words used by the hon. Attorney General? If the hon. member for Lambton were offended by the imputation made, he must be doubly offended by its being taken up in investigation by the house.<sup>143</sup> There was nothing before the House on which they could proceed. The proper course would have been to have had the words taken down by the Clerk and then there would have been on the records something as a basis for action.<sup>144</sup> Then it might have been considered what course should (*sic*) have been taken on them. The house was about to be constituted a Court for the examination of a case of scandal. He must protest against their proceeding with the discussion<sup>145</sup> and would vote against the committee.<sup>146</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH began by an acknowledgement that in the words he had made use of last night he was to a certain extent guilty. He sincerely regretted the use of those words. He had hitherto been on gentlemanly terms generally with all the members of the House; and at the conclusion of their labours had always been ready to give the right hand of fel[l]owship to every one of his fellow-labourers. For the offence of which he had been guilty he had, however, a stronger excuse than even the Hon. Attorney General. The speaker alluded to the case of some members of his family, whose endeavours to obtain attention had always been frustrated through the means of the honourable member for Lambton, while all the assertions made in reference to this had always been qualified as untrue, and he had had to bear the stigma attached to such a position.<sup>147</sup> The charges made last night had been repeatedly made before, but owing to the position which he occupied in regard to the parties connected with that investigation, he had been obliged to sit still and allow the matter to be undertaken, and the battle to be fought, by the hon. Attorney General. These same charges were made over and over again and he felt that his hon. friend

was fully warranted in making the accusations he had done.<sup>148</sup> The hon. speaker then proceeded to review the position of the question. They were asked to appoint a Committee to investigate the truth of certain allegations. Why was it that they were now asked to do so? Why was not such a committee appointed years ago? The same assertions had been made over and over again. Why had the honourable member never sought an explanation before? Why did he seek it now? They would all have been long ago investigated but for him. All the occurrences which had prevented the explanation of those transactions had been traced to him. If he had met the charges as he might have done years ago, none of the present disagreeableness would have taken place. It was in consequence of his endeavours to cloak all his conduct in relation to those matters that they never had been investigated.<sup>149</sup> He thought it most extraordi[n]ary that the member for Lambton, professing so much anxiety to get a Committee of investigation, had, during two successive sessions, used his influence to prevent any investigation, when the same charges made last night had been quite as strongly put. The member for Lambton might now suppose, that owing to the length of time which had elapsed, it might be difficult to prove the charges, but he would find that very strong evidence would still be produced.<sup>150</sup> He [Mr. Smith] was not now desirous that they should go into that investigation; if they did, he was satisfied that charges would be brought forward which would warrant the Attorney General in the observations he had made. There could be no doubt that the object the hon. member for Lambton had in view in those continual attacks which had provoked the remarks of his hon. friend, was a personal one. His object was to excite a political persecution against the members of the Government.<sup>151</sup> The hon. member for Lambton had told them he was oppointed (sic) a commissioner to enquire into a public institution, but that hon. gentleman had an object to attain by that investigation. He was desirous of making a political triumph over those who differed with him politically. It is a very singular fact, that every person connected with that institution who gave evidence in favor of the Warden, was dismissed and every person who had been formerly dismissed, and gave good evidence against the Warden, were taken on again. He recollected that a charge was made against one of the witnesses, and the hon. member for Lambton<sup>152</sup> refused to be sworn, and claimed to stand upon the privilege of his position as a commissioner, and refused to disclose the facts which were necessary in the investigation of the case. Why should he have so declined, when he had the opportunity of showing that his own conduct had been fair and honorable? He hoped the committee would be appointed, and that the hon. member for Lambton would be able to explain away all that appeared unfavorable in the case alluded to. This was the more necessary as<sup>153</sup> it was well known that only three of the commissioners acted on that investigation, one of whom was always asleep, and the hon. member for Lambton, in his twofold capacity of commissioner and secretary, wrote down what he pleased.<sup>154</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said they were not now investigating the charge brought against the Penitentiary, and therefore the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question.<sup>155</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH apologised. He said he would no longer detain them, but would simply say that the hon. member had nothing to complain of, because this matter might have been settled years ago if he had chosen.<sup>156</sup>

MR. BELLINGHAM regretted, that the time of the House should be occupied by this kind of discussion. He regretted too the occasion of it, and was convinced that the character of the House suffered by indulgence in these personalities,--the public imputing to them collectively what properly belonged to only a few parties, so that

they all fell under the displeasure of the public. Why had they arrived at this stage? The hon. member for Lambton, said he had his own peculiar opinions, and he ought to extend the same measure of judgment to this side of the House. He reminded the House, that there was even already a difference of opinion among members as to the words actually used. Himself and another member, talking on the subject almost immediately after they were used, found they had apprehended them differently. If the House were about to place them on record, they must be agreed on the words themselves.<sup>157</sup> He thought a dangerous precedence would be established by the appointment of a committee and would vote against it.<sup>158</sup>

CAPT. RHODES expressed in a few words his intention to vote against the measure<sup>159</sup>, on the same grounds<sup>160</sup>.

MR. S. SMITH thought the subject had not been taken up by the member for Lambton in a proper spirit. He thought it unfair to place any member of the House in a position to compel him to find another member guilty of so serious charges.<sup>161</sup> [OR] Mr. Smith ... asked whether it could be right to place any member of the House in the situation in which both the hon. members would be placed by an investigation of this nature? Here was a member accused of subo[r]nation of perjury. Was it fair for them to assume that any member could be guilty either of that or of the forgery which had been stated?--Had they the power of instituting a criminal inquiry into the conduct of these gentlemen in regard to matters taking place out of the House?--If the inquiry were insisted on, however, he should vote for it, although he considered that in acting on it they were acting unfairly to one another. Was it to be understood, that they were to find the member for Lambton guilty or not guilty of the offence charged,--or merely to report their opinion upon the charge as made in the House?<sup>162</sup> He thought the proper course would be to require the committee to report the evidence, and leave it to the House.<sup>163</sup>

MR. ROBINSON regretted the course taken in the consideration of this subject, as well as the occasion of it. The words ought to have been taken down. It would be very inexpedient for them to institute a trial upon the case. He regretted that they had not the advantage of Sir Allan MacNab's assistance in considering the law of Parliament; his long experience would have been of great advantage to them in the circumstances. He thought it would be better to postpone the debate, to give an opportunity for those friendly explanations which might make the further consideration of the matter needless.<sup>164</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND would only say that he did not think the Government ought to interfere in the matter. It was not for them to discountenance an investigation affecting one of their own number. They would leave it to the good sense of the majority of the House. They would naturally wish a full investigation to take place, but they would not oppose the wish of the hon. member for Lambton.<sup>165</sup>

MR. A. DORION, of Montreal, spoke at some length upon the question.<sup>166</sup> [He] thought the House was about to place itself in an anomalous position, an immediate retraction should have been compelled. If the Attorney General had proof of the correctness of his charge, it was his duty to have indicted him in the Committee. He thought the Committee should be appointed, but he feared that no great result would follow from it.<sup>167</sup> [He] observed that the House were about to try a member for subornation of perjury. Suppose it came out against the hon. member for Lambton? He would, of course, be liable to be tried by a court of law, and he would

be so under all the prejudice of having been found guilty by this House. If the charge was not substantiated, then the hon. Attorney General would be liable to an action for damages, under the prejudice of the acquittal. (Cry of "privilege.") He knew all that, but he knew also that a prejudice would be created by the result of the proceedings proposed.--No member in this House has a right to accuse another member of robbery, perjury or the suborning of witnesses. But if such charges are made, no other course is left open for the accused party but to meet the accusation. He feared the investigation would lead to little or no result. Members of Parliament frequently use language on the floor of this House which is unbecoming and disrespectful. It has gone out through the country that the Attorney General West has accused an honourable member of this House of the serious crime of forgery, suborning of witnesses, pardoning of murderers, &c. And must the hon. member for Lambton sit quietly and receive unrefuted such allegations? No, sir. The speaker said that he exceedingly regretted the turn of last night's debate, because it would bring disagreement into the House. But if the Attorney General West will make no apology, there is only this one course left for the member for Lambton to pursue.<sup>168</sup> He admired the conduct of the Solicitor General who had, last night and again to-day, frankly expressed his regret for language which, in the heat of debate, he used, and thought the Attorney General would have done himself credit by following so good an example.<sup>169</sup> He did not think the House had any right to take up such a question, but the hon. member having called for a committee, he thought he was entitled to it.<sup>170</sup>

MR. LORANGER asked if the commission under which the hon. member was accused of acting improperly<sup>171</sup> was one appointed by Parliament. (Cries of No!) If not, he did not see what jurisdiction the present Parliament had over the matter.<sup>172</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said the commission was appointed by the Government, but the report was subject to the consideration of the House.<sup>173</sup>

MR. STEVENSON opposed the appointment of a Committee, because he thought it would have no good result. If either party were condemned, satisfaction would not be given.<sup>174</sup> The people would still hold views in accordance with their particular predilections. The precedent was most dangerous, and he should regret to see the Committee granted, however unfair the refusal might appear.<sup>175</sup>

MR. CHABOT spoke on the question at some length. He said he would have voted against the appointment of a committee but from the fact, that it was asked for by the accused; he would, therefore, vote for it.<sup>176</sup>

MR. ROBINSON thought they would get into endless difficulty by acting upon the rule laid down by the hon. member for Quebec. There was another mode of settling this question, which he thought might have been adopted, (hear, hear.) He did not mean pistols for two and coffee for one, or anything of that kind. But the hon. member for Lambton might have taken a witness with him, and have waited upon the Attorney General, and stated to him that he had used words which were actionable, and if he had repeated them in the street he would have indicted him. And if he repeated these words now he would do so. He was sure that the Attorney General would not refuse to make the statements again, if he were assured they were true.<sup>177</sup>

MR. PAPIN blamed the Speaker for allowing the language of the Attorney General to pass at the time; if this had been done, the present difficulty would have been avoided.<sup>178</sup>

MR. CHAPPAIS would vote for the Committee, because he was politically opposed to the member for Lambton.<sup>179</sup>

MR. BROWN then rose and said, he did not agree with the hon. member for Montreal, that the Committee, if granted, would have no satisfactory result; and he hoped no friend of his would put forward such an argument. The proceedings of the Committee could have but one result--and that was to show, that not only was it impossible to establish the charges preferred by the Attorney-General, but that they had not the shadow of a shade of foundation. (Hear, hear.) If the scene of the previous evening had been calculated to produce a feeling of humiliation in all present, it did appear to him that the exhibition of the hon. gentleman opposite, to-day, had been still more humiliating. What had they witnessed? The hon. Attorney General made a charge last night, which, if true, ought not only to banish him (Mr. Brown) from this House, but should stamp him with infamy for life; he declared that the charges were true, and if he (Mr. Brown) dared to demand a Committee of Inquiry, he would prove them to be so. Well, he had demanded an inquiry--he had defied the hon. gentleman to the proof--and then the Attorney-General comes down from his position, and tells the House that he did not make these foul statements on his own knowledge, but on the assurance of others whose names he did not give. (Hear, hear.) Nay, he tried to turn off the charge into another channel altogether--into a question whether Mr. Henry Smith, the father of his colleague the Solicitor-General, had been fairly tried and condemned by the five Penitentiary Commissioners<sup>180</sup>. That had nothing to do with the present charges. These previous charges were never made before, and when it is said, Why did not he ask for a committee before? he would say because the charges were always made upon the broad ground of not having conducted that investigation properly. The hon. gentleman had on previous occasions stated that he knew nothing of this matter of his own personal knowledge, but he gave the views of the parties who had informed him.... Now he says that he is prepar[e]d to prove the charges himself.<sup>181</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said he did not say so.<sup>182</sup>

MR. BROWN.--What did you say, then?<sup>183</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--That I brought these charges before, and that I offered to prove them then and there, and could do it now. The hon. gentleman knows I have no personal knowledge of the matter. I was not a witness. Nor had I anything to do with the commission. I said however that I offered to prove it then, and would prove it now.<sup>184</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman spoke much more strongly last night. He asserted over and over again that the charges were true, and that he would prove them so.<sup>185</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--The hon. member has agreed to the motion that a committee may be appointed.<sup>186</sup>

MR. BROWN.--What he wanted to show was that he had never been charged with such things before. No gentleman had dared to do so before.<sup>187</sup> His [Mr. Macdonald's] charges of 1850 and 1851 were in regard to the general treatment of Mr. Henry Smith, and were directed at the other members of the Commission quite as much as at him (Mr. Brown). His charges of last night were certainly personal to himself and had they been made before, would have been met as promptly and determinedly as now. The

charges formerly brought by the hon. gentleman were made on the authority of persons named by him at the time, and he expressly disavowed all knowledge or responsibility for their truth. And who were those parties? Why, the very men whose conduct had been condemned by the Commissioners, and who were, in consequence, ejected from their situations in the Prison. (Hear, hear.)<sup>188</sup> Whoever knew a criminal who did not find fault with his judge?<sup>189</sup> It was on the accusations of such persons that the Attorney General would have had the five Commissioners ask an enquiry. (Hear, hear.) They would do nothing of the kind. But it became a very different thing when the Attorney General on his own responsibility preferred charges, and those of so grave a character.<sup>190</sup> It ill-became hon. gentlemen in the Treasury Benches to endeavor to get up an excitement against him in the House, by bringing forward all sorts of stories about newspaper paragraphs. The Attorney General, East, has stated that the charges were made in a hasty and lamentable manner, and no man regretted more than he did that these charges had been made. He would ask the House whether, if such was the fact, would it not have been his duty rather to have had him (Mr. Brown) indicted before the criminal court? But the charges had been kept up until now.<sup>191</sup> Hon. gentlemen had suggested that he should withdraw his motion; he was utterly astonished that any one could think of such a thing for a moment. How could he sit silent under such a charge--dared as he had been to the ordeal. (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Attorney General must prove his charges, or stand convicted of the foulest slander ever uttered on the floor of Parliament.<sup>192</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE commenced by saying that since 1851 nothing was heard of these charges now made. But, after a lapse of several years, at a late hour of the night, these grave accusations are made. It would have been much more to the credit of the Attorney General West had he apologized for his language as uttered in the heat of temper. When several years ago the Attorney General West spoke with bitterness against the hon. gentleman from Lambton, we heard nothing of all these accusations. When I read of the infamous treatment of the prisoners in the Penitentiary several years ago, I was glad that the father of the Solicitor General Smith was turned out. Now the Attorney General West has for these long years kept silence on the subject. He thought it was a great pity that the members could not assemble here without the enactment of such scenes. The hon. gentlemen may speak boldly and freely on political matters, but never should give utterance to such expressions as those under consideration. The gentlemen on the Treasury Benches pretend to teach us rules of conduct, but, if the scene of last night is a sample of their rules of behaviour, all such members had better resume their seats in the Quarter Sessions or the Old Bailey. Do these gentlemen say that all these crimes alleged have been committed by a gentleman high in position and political influence as the hon. member from Lambton? If we are to call each other rogues, forgers, perjurers, &c., &c., where is it all to end? He was grieved at the disgraceful scene. If anything was done in the settlement of the affair it must be by kindly feelings and words.<sup>193</sup>

MR. J. MORRISON (of Niagara) would, with great reluctance, vote for the Committee. He had in 1850 defended the hon. member for Lambton on this very subject. He did not then believe the charges, nor does he now.<sup>194</sup> His hon. friend he knew to be incapable of the things he was charged with. The Attorney General West may be sincere, but the charges are incapable of proof. It was very painful to have these matters before the House. Wholesale charges are too frequently made on both sides of this House. No gentleman should use language in this House which he would not use in private society. He trusted that it was the last time such language would be allowed. If the hon. gentleman from Kingston had retracted, he would have been

accused through the session of having made false statements.<sup>195</sup> Seeing the feeling of the House favorable to a committee, he would not object to it, although it was a very bad precedent.<sup>196</sup> He hoped the committee would come to a satisfactory decision on the matter.<sup>197</sup>

MR. TURCOTTE suggested that the member for Lambton should withdraw his motion, and publicly challenge the Attorney General to a proof of the charges to a jury of his countrymen. This course would answer every purpose.<sup>198</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY having, with the permission of the House, withdrawn his amendment,<sup>199</sup>

[Mr. Brown's] motion as amended by Mr. Cameron was passed.<sup>200</sup>

(63)

Mr. Brown moved, seconded by the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, and the Question being put, That the Honorable John A. Macdonald, Attorney General for Upper Canada, having, in the course of a Debate on last evening, charged Mr. George Brown, a Member of this House, while acting, in 1848, as a Member and Secretary of the Commission appointed by Government to inquire into the condition of the Provincial

(64)

Penitentiary:--First, With having recorded falsely the evidence of witnesses examined before the said Commission: Second, With having altered the written testimony given by witnesses after their evidence was closed and subscribed: Third, With having suborned convicts to commit perjury: Fourth, With having obtained the pardon of murderers confined to the Penitentiary, to induce them to give false evidence, or in words substantially to the same effect; and the said Honorable John A. Macdonald having pledged himself to substantiate these charges, a special Committee of seven Members be appointed to inquire and report with all convenient speed as to the truth of the said charges, with power to send for persons, papers, and records; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Bowes, Brodeur, Brown, Bureau, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chapais, Chisholm, Christie, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cooke, Cook, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Charles Daoust, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, Delong, Desaulniers, Dionne, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Fergusson, Ferrie, Flint, Foley, Thomas Fortier, Fournier, Frazer, Freeman, Galt, Gamble, Gill, Gould, Guévremont, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jackson, Laberge, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, John S. Macdonald, Attorney General Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Mattice, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Munro, Niles, Papin, Patrick, Pouliot, Prévost, Rankin, Roblin, Rolph, Solicitor General Ross, Scatcherd, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Turcotte, Valois, Wilson, Wright, Yeilding, and Young.--(94.)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Ferres, Octave C. Fortier, Larwill, Lumsden, Murney, Poulin, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Stevenson, and Thibaudeau.--(12.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.<sup>201</sup>

On the question for the naming of the committee,

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND submitted whether it would not be better to postpone the naming of the committee until to-morrow. Between this and then, these hon. gentlemen might find some way of obviating the difficulty. The hon. member for Niagara said he hoped the committee would find some way of settling the matter without enlarging upon an enquiry; but it was evident that if the committee was named they must enter upon an investigation of the charges. This investigation must be a very tedious one, and must take up much of the time of the members appointed on it, and would be attended with great expense, as many of the witnesses (sic) to be brought forward might live at a great distance.<sup>202</sup> It would ... be a useless expenditure of public money. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that the matter would be settled, and all this bickering put an end to. He thought it unnecessary that the Committee should be appointed at that time.<sup>203</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER read a rule of the House applicable to the circumstances, which made it imperative that the Committee should be selected immediately.<sup>204</sup> The motion to grant a committee having been adopted, there was no way of obviating the necessity of at once complying with the requirements of the motion.<sup>205</sup>

The Committee was then named by the House<sup>206</sup>.

(64)

*Ordered, That Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Masson, Mr. Felton, Mr. Clarke, and Mr. Ferres, do compose the said Committee.*<sup>207</sup>

*The Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, rose in his place, and acquainted Mr. Speaker and the House, that His Excellency the Governor General will receive the House with its Address in answer to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the present Session, To-morrow, at half-past three o'clock, at the Government House.*

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND stated that his Excellency ... was prepared to receive it ... [today], but deferred it in consequence of the debate on Tuesday night.<sup>208</sup>

(64)

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,  
The House adjourned.*<sup>209</sup>

APPENDIX: 27 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCE.]

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, on the part of Sir Allan MacNab,<sup>210</sup> [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to establish an efficient Police Force in this Province.<sup>211</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: RELIGIOUS, CHARITABLE AND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETIES.]

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to provide a uniform mode of incorporating Societies for Religious, Charitable and Educational purposes.<sup>212</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: COURTS OF QUEEN'S BENCH AND COMMON PLEAS IN UPPER CANADA.]

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend, repeal and consolidate the provisions of certain Acts therein mentioned, and to simplify and expedite the proceedings in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Upper Canada.<sup>213</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: COURT OF ERROR AND APPEAL.]

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to alter and amend so much of the Statute 12 Vict., cap. 63, as relates to the constitution of the Court of Error and Appeal.<sup>214</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.]

MR. HUOT [donne avis que] vendredi prochain [il fera motion pour un] Bill pour établir le suffrage universel et le vote au scrutin dans les élections politiques des membres de l'assemblée législative.<sup>215</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ELECTIVE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.]

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON [gave notice that] on Friday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill, intituled, an Act to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council by rendering the same elective.<sup>216</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ORDNANCE LANDS.]

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to authorize the immediate commutation of claims on Ordnance lands upon the transfer of such lands to the Province.<sup>217</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: FREE BANKING ACT.]

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY [gave notice that] on Tuesday next [he would move for leave to introduce a] Bill to amend the Act for establishing freedom of Banking.<sup>218</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: ALLOWANCES REMITTED TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.]

M. HUOT [donne avis que] lundi prochain [il fera motion pour une] Adresse pour un état indiquant les diverses sommes payées à des membres du parlement employés au règlement de la tenure seigneuriale, et aussi, pour ouvrages faits pour arpentages, et, généralement, pour tous ouvrages sous le patronage du gouvernement, exécutés par des membres de l'assemblée législative depuis le 1er février 1855 à venir jusqu'[à] aujourd'hui.<sup>219</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.]

MR. HUOT [donne avis que] mardi prochain [il] proposera les résolutions suivantes:

Que cette chambre est d'opinion que la peine de mort est un châtiment qui ne devrait plus être appliqué dans notre état de société, comme contraire aux sentiments d'humanité.

Qu'en conséquence la peine de mort pour toute sorte de crimes auxquels la loi pénale l'applique soit abolie dans la province du Canada.<sup>220</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. HUOT [donne avis que] vendredi prochain [il] proposera: Que cette chambre est d'opinion que le système alter[na]tif pratiqué pour le siège du gouvernement est incompatible avec une saine législation et l'économie dans les dépenses publiques.

Qu'en conséquence le siège du parlement soit fixé d'une manière permanente à tel endroit que cette chambre le jugera à propos, et que le gouvernement soit prié de faire voter dans le cours de cette session les sommes d'argent nécessaires à la construction des édifices qui devront servir de lieu de réunion des séances législatives.<sup>221</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. J.S. MACDONALD wished to have some day fixed for the discussion of the Seat of Government question. It was a matter of great importance, and honorable members should be prepared to discuss it.<sup>222</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND stated that the Government would fix a day to-morrow evening.<sup>223</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 27 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. Contrary to normal procedures, this petition was never read in the House; however, GLOBE, 28 February 1856, provides the following description: "By Mr. Huot, from Benjamin Vehl and others of the parish of Ancienne Lorette, alleging the election of Mr. Evanturel as a member from Quebec, to be illegal, and praying the issue of a new warrant".
2. This petition relates to a line of Telegraph from Quebec to Forteau Bay, as properly described above in the Petitions read section.
3. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
4. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
5. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. According to TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 20 February 1856, a notice of motion concerning this Bill was duly given by Mr. S. Smith on the 19th February (see page 38, footnote 27). However, on the 29th February 1856, Mr. Smith presents a similar Bill, this time for the township of Hamilton, for which we do not have a reported notice of motion.
6. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
7. IBID.
8. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. Mr. Brown here rises to answer the accusations that were preferred against him on the preceding night. We again add in footnote excerpts of those commentaries which give additional information or which attempt to bring on a better comprehension of this debate.

Other commentaries are also reported in the following newspapers: HASTINGS CHRONICLE, WELLAND HERALD, GALT REFORMER, PETERBORO' DISPATCH, HAMILTON BANNER, BRANTFORD EXPOSITOR, WOODSTOCK SPIRIT OF THE TIMES, KENT ADVERTISER, HAMILTON GAZETTE, COBOURG SUN, ST. CATHARINES POST, STRATFORD BEACON, MONTREAL ARGUS (all reprinted in GLOBE, 10 March 1856); WOODSTOCK SENTINEL (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856); and GLOBE, 19 March 1856.
9. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
10. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
11. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
12. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
14. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
15. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
16. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. In a commentary, QUEBEC GAZETTE, 4 March 1856, gives some additional information, as follows: "The Warden cheated convicts out of their food, the province out of the proceeds of convict labor, kept carriages and horses for himself and for his sons at the expense of the province".
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
18. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
19. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
20. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
21. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
22. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
24. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
25. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
26. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
27. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
28. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
29. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.

30. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. Several commentaries mirror some of the assertions made by Mr. Brown in the course of his speech. For example, on the question of the "time" chosen by Mr. J.A. Macdonald to prefer his charges, MONTREAL HERALD (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), writes: "We are no defenders of the conduct of the Penitentiary Commission. We have always thought that affair a job of the worst kind, and we have always believed that, besides spinning out the time for the employment of which they were so well paid, the Commissioners behaved often in a very arbitrary manner. But these new charges--made eight years after the occurrences, five or six years after all mention of them has ceased, three or four years after a period when the present accuser has lived on terms of personal and political friendship with the person he has now ventured to accuse of felony--these are altogether of another complexion from any imputations we have ever yet heard upon the Commissioners. If they had been true, if the public service required that they should be pushed, they should not have slumbered all through the time when it suited the person who now makes them to co-operate with the person against whom they are made."

LONDON FREE PRESS (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), reports a similar argument in its Editorial Correspondence: "If Mr. Macdonald had it within his power to prove that Mr. Brown had committed forgery, had suborned witnesses, and procured the pardon of murderers (sic) and malefactors for his own private ends, why, as a good citizen, did he not bring the matter before those tribunals of the country which are appointed to consider such cases?--Why has he allowed so bad a man, as he considers Mr. Brown to be, to have sat in two Parliaments since he knew him to be guilty of those alleged crimes? More; why has he invited Mr. Brown to break his bread, to hold social intercourse with him, and even to be in his confidence? It must either be believed that Mr. Macdonald had not one particle of evidence of the alleged crimes, or else it must be considered that he has neglected one of the first duties of a citizen, and is consequently, unworthy of holding a position in any government."

31. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 32. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.  
 33. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 34. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.  
 35. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 36. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.  
 37. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.  
 38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 39. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.  
 40. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 41. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.  
 42. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.  
 43. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.  
 44. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.  
 45. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.  
 46. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856. In a commentary, GLOBE, 7 March 1856, refutes some of Mr. Macdonald's assertions regarding the Penitentiary Commission. It states: "It is quite true that the Commissioners did not seek to be placed on their trial on the mere accusation of Mr. Henry Smith; it is quite true that Mr. Richards came to the gallery of the House in 1851, while the debate was proceeding, to learn the facts from Mr. Brown; and it is quite true that Mr. Brown was most indignant at the lame defence which was offered for the Commissioners by those who were bound to have made themselves acquainted with

the facts, and to have shown the propriety of the course pursued by the Commission. But the allegation is quite false that any influence whatever was used with the Ministry to coerce their action. On the contrary, Mr. Brown did not know until half an hour before the debate came on, that such a motion was to be made--and moreover, the files of the Globe will show that at the very moment of the debate, that journal was in opposition to the Government. The Government suspended Mr. Warden Smith, until the report of the Commissioners should be received--at a later stage they ordered him to leave the Penitentiary while the enquiry was proceeding--and on receiving the report of the Commission, they sustained the Commissioners, and dismissed Mr. Smith. Nay, the Government heard all Mr. Smith's complaints of ill usage and demands for inquiry, read all his papers, pronounced upon them, upheld the Commissioners, and returned Mr. Smith his documents! How, then, could they grant a Committee of inquiry into the proceedings of their own Commissioners, whose every act they had endorsed, and whose recommendations they had accepted? They had assumed deliberately full responsibility for the proceedings of the Commissioners, by approving of their conclusions and acting on all their suggestions, and any attack made on the verdict was an attack on them, as the executive power, much more than on the Commissioners. The Commissioners had no desire to avoid inquiry into any act of theirs; but they felt that to place them on trial on the unsupported assertions of Mr. Henry Smith, would have been a most strange proceeding on the part of a Government which had examined into all those assertions and pronounced them false. The statement that Mr. Brown told Mr. Justice Richards that he apprehended disastrous consequences from an inquiry, is totally false."

47. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
48. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
49. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, reports that Mr. Smith, Warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, was given "two years' arrears of salary".
50. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
51. IBID.
52. IBID.
53. IBID.
54. IBID.
55. IBID.
56. IBID.
57. IBID.
58. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
59. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
60. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
61. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
62. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
63. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
64. IBID.
65. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
66. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
67. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
68. IBID.
69. IBID.
70. IBID.
71. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
72. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
73. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.

74. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
75. IBID.
76. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
77. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
78. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
79. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
80. IBID.
81. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
82. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
83. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
84. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
85. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
86. IBID.
87. IBID.
88. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856. On the subject of the charges made by the Globe against Mr. J.A. Macdonald, and of this gentleman's subsequent retaliation, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856, maintains that "not only in Parliament, but in his Press, Mr. Brown has brought against the Attorney-General charges of personal corruption. Day after day, it has been repeated in the Globe that Mr. Macdonald passed an Act of Parliament for the purpose of robbing the City of Hamilton of a large sum of money, which he appropriated to his own use. These accusations, made by a journal circulating largely through the country, are irritating." Furthermore, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856, states: "This is carrying opposition to a Minister à l'outrance, and no man can wonder that such unjustifiable slander should have led to a feeling at the time in the breast of the Attorney General which it only required Mr. Brown's peculiarly insolent style of personal attack on the floor of the House to reawaken, and incite him even to such an attack as that of last night."

In a long commentary, MONTREAL ARGUS (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), offers a very different opinion, reproving Mr. Macdonald's response to these attacks. It states: "It is perfectly clear those strictures--admitting even that Mr. Brown penned them himself, have really no relation whatsoever to the present altercation. If Mr. Macdonald felt his personal honor aggrieved or his reputation injured, there are different courses which a man of honor and a man of law understands, any of which he had the option of taking. It is, however, totally inconsistent with the code of honor, the reason every one possessed of that quality understands--to bottle up an injury for future resentment. The Courts of Law, too, were open to him; and he certainly had shewn that there was no indisposition to resort to them when he advised the Premier to prosecute the Banner at the public expense. On the same grounds, and with the same means at his disposal, he could have prosecuted the Globe". MONTREAL HERALD (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), also provides a commentary expressing similar views: "[Mr. J.A. Macdonald] ought to have withdrawn the hasty words into which he had been tempted. He would certainly not then have lacked sympathy as an individual. But the moment of excitement passed away; he had opportunity to retrace his steps; and his persistence in wrong is not the act of the man in a passion, but of the public minister wasting the public time and degrading the popular branch of the sovereignty to vile personal ends. What had Parliament to do with the charges made against Mr. McDonald in the debenture case? If he were slandered, he had the Courts of Law open, and he might have tried his fortune there like his illustrious chief.... At any rate, no one had made any allusion to that affair in the House; and if the passion of the night had led to wrong doing, the reflection of the morning ought to have induced a man occupying the

distinguished position of the Attorney General to see that the slander--if it were one--could not properly be avenged in Parliament."

89. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
90. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
91. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
92. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
93. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
94. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
95. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
96. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
97. IBID.
98. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
99. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
100. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
101. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
102. IBID.
103. IBID.
104. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
105. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
106. IBID.
107. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
108. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
109. IBID.
110. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
111. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
112. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
113. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
114. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
115. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
116. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
117. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
118. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
119. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
120. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
121. MORNING CHRONICLE, 3 March 1856.
122. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
123. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
124. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
125. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
126. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
127. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 29 February 1856.
128. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
129. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
130. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
131. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
132. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
133. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
134. IBID.
135. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
136. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
137. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
138. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
139. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.

140. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
141. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
142. IBID.
143. IBID.
144. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
145. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
146. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
147. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
148. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
149. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
150. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
151. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
152. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
153. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
154. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
155. IBID.
156. IBID.
157. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
158. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
159. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
160. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
161. IBID.
162. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
163. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
164. GLOBE, 28 February 1856. In a commentary, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 29 February 1856, notes: "Sir A. MacNab is said to be sick."
165. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
166. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
167. MORNING CHRONICLE, 4 March 1856.
168. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
169. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
170. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
171. IBID.
172. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
173. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
174. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
175. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
176. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
177. IBID.
178. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. MONTREAL ARGUS (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), offers a similar point of view in its commentary: "A charge of so gross a character being made from the floor of the House on a member, it was the duty of the House to call the accusing member to retract it at once, and failing compliance, to inflict such punishment as the offending party merited."
179. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
180. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
181. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
182. IBID.
183. IBID.
184. IBID.
185. IBID.
186. IBID.
187. IBID.

188. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
189. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
190. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
191. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
192. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
193. IBID.
194. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. According to TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, "Mr. Mackenzie and the hon. Mr. Morrison both addressed the House at some length."
195. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
196. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
197. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
198. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
199. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
200. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
201. HAMILTON BANNER (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), reports the following commentary on today's debate and vote: "To their shame, be it said, they [the Ministry] threw every possible obstruction in the way of granting the Committee. They persisted in their opposition to Mr. Brown's righteous request, until they saw that their principal supporters favored it." WESTERN PLANET, 6 March 1856, expresses the following point of view: "We believe the majority of members in the House would have voted against the committee, had it not been asked so promptly for by Mr. Brown himself, considering it an act of justice to that gentleman's character to have the unfortunate affair immediately investigated.... There was evidently however a determination on the part of the ministry to quash the enquiry, but many of their supporters voted for Mr. Brown's motion".

The charges against Mr. Brown and his subsequent motion for a Committee of investigation led to a myriad of speculations from the newspapers that reported commentaries on the event. Many of these commentaries mirror the ongoing discussion on the disunion that is said to exist within the Government, and within the Opposition, as well as on the respective merits of the leaders of the different parties represented in the House. More notable, though, are the incisive commentaries of some newspapers which openly hint that the incident was somewhat "planned" by the Ministry. BOWMANVILLE STATESMAN (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), expresses such an opinion when it writes: "It is no use for the Government or their organs to attempt an escape from the stigma attaching to their Goliath, by trying to make it appear that he (Mr. Macdonald) spoke unawares through irritation, caused by Mr. Brown's attack on the government, for we happen to know, by incontrovertible evidence, that the attack was plotted at least a month before, and we believe that the whole affair is got up to draw off Mr. Brown's attention from their foul deeds, and to occupy his precious time with defending himself". HURON SIGNAL (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), expresses the same point of view: "But, floating on the surface of the whole scene, are strong grounds for the suspicion, that a premeditated, systematic plot for the moral and political destruction of George Brown, occupied the background. The promptitude with which a Mr. Casault came forward in corroboration of some of the Attorney General's statements--the readiness with which Solicitor General Smith (an interested party,) jumped up and said to Mr. Brown, 'You are a convicted liar, sit down;' the shuffling of the Ministry to screen the Attorney General, and the visible desire of that gentleman to back out of his awkward position, all seem to indicate a plot for the destruction of the Member for Lambton". DUNDAS TRIBUNE (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), also asserts

that "the whole thing is trumped up to destroy the influence which Mr. Brown possesses over the public mind of Upper Canada."

WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, argues "that if the member for Lambton is to be made the great leading politician in Upper Canada, those who profess to be his opponents are taking exactly the best course to accomplish that purpose. His name is trumpeted everywhere, and a man only requires notoriety to get influence thereafter." MORNING CHRONICLE, 4 March 1856, offers an interesting view on this point, which at the same time reflects the opinion of many other newspapers. It states: "In the Legislature, Mr. Brown unquestionably occupies a most singular position; he has hardly a follower to back him in his crotchets, and yet he engrosses more attention than any other representative. His speeches, his writings, his personal agency at elections, and his past course in political life, are the theme of the majority of the addresses delivered from the ministerial benches. This is, assuredly, a mistaken course, and if persevered in must eventually have a contrary effect to what his assailants intend. By their unceasing attentions, the member for Lambton certainly profits, and gains a popularity which his own exertions could never achieve; for there are persons of the most moderate disposition who will make common cause even with a man whose conduct they censure, if they see him decried in a way which they conceive his acts do not justify."

Finally, many newspapers speculate on the consequences of the investigation for both Mr. Brown and Mr. J.A. Macdonald. WESTERN PLANET, 6 March 1856, provides a commentary on this point: "We are not altogether certain whether this was a question with which the House has anything to do. It was certainly a matter more of a personal and private nature, than one in which the interests of the country were at all involved, and we do think that as such, Mr. Brown's course to clear himself of the vile imputations lay with a court of law, and its decision should more or less influence the action, the House would afterwards deem its duty to take in reference to the guilty. If Mr. Brown would there exonerate himself from the false accusations, Parliament could not tolerate the slanderer to occupy any longer his seat. Neither could the ministry suffer him to remain in the highest and most responsible office in the country. If on the other hand Mr. Brown should be proved guilty of the charges, he would necessarily have to vacate his seat, to suffer a punishment commensurate with his crimes. This seems to us the most equitable mode of adjusting the difficulty". HAMILTON BANNER (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), goes a little further and states: "The issue will eventuate, either in the disgrace of Attorney General McDonald and his expulsion from the House, or the disgrace not only of the member for Lambton, but of the Hon. Adam Ferguson, Mr. Sherrif Thomas, of this city, Mr. Bristow, of the Montreal Argus, and Mr. Amiot, who were also associated with him on the Penitentiary Commission." Finally, BOWMANVILLE STATESMAN (in GLOBE, 10 March 1856), prefers the following advice in its commentary: "We hope that the country will keep its eye on this trial, and closely watch its progress, and the verdict of the committee and the House in reference to Mr. MacDonald's conduct. There must not be any covering up of the matter; if Mr. Brown be guilty let it be clearly stated, and if he is not, let the proper redress be made to Mr. Brown. We feel quite satisfied that this attack will result in the elevation of Mr. Brown to a greater political position than he ever held before in Canada; and it seems that the organs are aware of this, as they are evidently preparing for a new election."

202. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.

203. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.

204. IBID.

205. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
206. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, reports "the selection of members was made by ballot."
207. WESTERN PLANET, 10 March 1856, reports the following comment on the Committee named: "The House appointed a committee with a Ministerial majority of five to two. I am afraid that except Mr. Stevenson, none of these are men in whom moderate men will put much confidence. One of them is Mr. Mas[s]on--the most fantastical and violent haters of Mr. Brown, on the grounds of that gentlemen's (sic) attachment to Upper Canadian and Protestant interests.... If Mr. Brown can pass such an ordeal as this his character must be bright as the sun." MONTREAL HERALD (in GLOBE, 12 March 1856), expresses a very similar opinion: "Think of Felton, and Ferres, Clarke and Masson, being put upon such a tribunal! The other ministerial member, Mr. Stevenson, is a highly respectable man; but scarcely, I think, a sufficiently strong minded man to oppose the acts of his four allies, while those who, from their political position, are expected to see fair play to the accused, are but two among seven."
- MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 1 March 1856, very ironically comments that these gentlemen form "the Committee to investigate the temporary insanity, or three o'clock in the morning, case--commonly known as Geo. Brown's complaint against crackskulls."
208. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
209. According to GLOBE, 28 February 1856, and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, the House adjourned at 10 o'clock.
210. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 28 February 1856.
211. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
212. IBID.
213. IBID.
214. IBID.
215. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
216. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
217. IBID.
218. IBID.
219. LE PAYS, 6 March 1856.
220. IBID.
221. IBID.
222. GLOBE, 28 February 1856.
223. IBID.

THURSDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 1856.<sup>1</sup>

(65)

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House, That his Warrant for the appointment of Members to serve on the General Committee of Elections was upon the table; and the said Warrant was read, as followeth:--

Pursuant to the thirtieth Section of "The Election Petitions' Act of 1851," I do hereby appoint the Honorable William Hamilton Merritt, Member for the County of Lincoln; the Honorable William Benjamin Robinson, Member for the South Riding of the County of Simcoe; the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, Member for the County of Glengarry; the Honorable John Young, Member for the City of Montreal; Joseph Curran Morrison, Esquire, Member for the Town of Niagara; and Joseph Edouard Turcotte, Esquire, Member for the County of Maskinongé; to be Members of the General Committee of Elections for the present Session.

Given under my hand, this twenty-eighth day of February, One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

Louis Victor Sicotte,  
Speaker, Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker laid before the House,--Return from the City and District Savings Bank of Montreal, on First January, One thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, in conformity to the [Act] 4 and 5 Vic. cap. 32, sec. 13.

For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 5.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of Gédéon Poirier, President, and others, School Commissioners of the Parish of St. Esprit, County of Montcalm.

By Mr. Thomas Fortier,--The Petition of the Reverend T. Caron and others, of the Parish of Ste. Monique; and the Petition of Norbert Béliveau, of the Parish of St. Grégoire, County of Nicolet.

By Mr. Church,--The Petition of E. McCrea and others, of the Village of Merrickville; the Petition of John Chester and others, of the Township of Montague, County of Lanark; the Petition of William Kerfoot and others, of the Township of Montague, County of Lanark; and the Petition of John Chester and others, of the Township of Montague, County of Lanark.<sup>2</sup>

By Mr. Christie,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Onondago, County of Brant; the Petition of the Town Council of the Town of Paris; and the Petition of Lyman Chapin, Chairman of a Public meeting on behalf of the rate-payers of the Township of Brantford.

By Mr. Bowes,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Bruce, County of Bruce.

By Mr. Somerville,--The Petition of James McArthur and others, proprietors of lands in the first range of the Parish of St. Anicet, County of Huntingdon.

By the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond,--The Petition of the College of Bytown.

By Mr. Chisholm,--The Petition of Thompson Smith and others, of the Counties of Halton, Peel, and York; and the Petition of Aaron Oliphant and others, of the Counties of Halton, Peel, and York.

By Mr. Frazer,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

By Mr. Marchildon,--The Petition of the Reverend J.E.D. Dupuis, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Ste. Anne de la Pérade, District of Three Rivers.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of the Mount Pleasant Seminary Association.

(66)

By Mr. Flint,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Hastings.

By Mr. Laberge,--Two Petitions of L'Institut Canadien d'Iberville.

By Mr. Whitney,--The Petition of the Corresponding Committee, at Montreal, of the Colonial Church and School Society; and the Petition of Mrs. Eliza M. Hervey, Directress and others, the Committee of the Home and School of Industry of Montreal.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of P. Manny; and the Petition of Thomas Scholfield and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

By the Honorable Mr. Chabot,--The Petition of Pierre Boisseau, of the City of Quebec.

By Mr. Rankin,--The Petition of Edwin Larwill and A. Rankin, of the Counties of Essex and Kent.

By Mr. Jackson,--The Petition of William Miller and others, of the Town of Sydenham.

By Mr. Hartman,--The Petition of Francis Rae and others, of the Village of Stouffville, County of York.

By Mr. Ferres,--The Petition of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Montreal.

By Mr. Felton,--The Petition of the Sherbrooke Academy; the Petition of the Institut Littéraire of Sherbrooke; the Petition of the Sherbrooke Academy; and the Petition of Caleb Jordan, of the Townships within the Eastern Circuit of the District of St. Francis.

By Mr. Loranger,--The Petition of P.N. Dorion and others, of the Township of Grantham; and the Petition of G.S. Marler, Mayor, and others, of the Township of Grantham, County of Drummond.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of the Seminary of Nicolet; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend John Harper, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St. Gregoire, County of Nicolet; praying aid for a Female Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Eardley, County of Ottawa; of the Municipality of the Township [of] Buckingham, County of Ottawa; of the Municipality of the Township of Masham, County of Ottawa; of the Municipality of the Village of Buckingham, County of Ottawa; of the Municipality of the Township of Wakefield, County of Ottawa; of the Municipality of the Township of Aylmer, County of Ottawa; and of the Municipality of the Township of Lochaber, County of Ottawa; praying that means may be taken in order to ascertain the feasibility and cost of the construction of a Ship Canal or Railway, between the Western Lakes and the side-waters of the St. Lawrence, by the Ottawa River.

Of Robert D. Rogers and others, of the "Scotch Village," in the Township of Otonabee; praying for the passing of an Act Incorporating the Village of Otonabee.

Of George Munro, of the City of Toronto, Merchant; setting forth that he has been unjustly deprived of lot number thirty-seven, in the ninth concession, Township of Nottawasaga, and praying relief in the premises.

Of James Dandy and others, of the Township of Hawkesburg (sic), County of Prescott; of the Session of the Free Presbyterian Church of St. Catharines; and of the Ontario Division, number twenty-six, of the Sons of Temperance; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of the Reverend J.R. Paré, Curé of the Parish of St. Jacques, County of Montcalm; praying aid for the School under the superintendence of the "Communauté des Dames Religieuses du Sacré Coeur de Jésus."

*Of the Session of the Free Presbyterian Church of St. Catharines; praying for*

(67)

*the abolition of Sunday labour in the Post Office, on the St. Lawrence Canals, and Railroads.*

*Of the St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum of the City of Montreal; praying for aid.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the Town of Brantford; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway Company to lease their Road, and also for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.*

*Of Alexander McNabb, Reeve, of the Township of Saugeen, and others of the Township of Bruce; praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the construction of a Railroad from the waters of Lake Huron at Saugeen, to the waters of Ontario at Toronto.*

*Of the Municipal Council of the County of Chicoutimi; praying that the Counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay may be exempted from the provisions of the Act 12 Vic., cap. 112.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of Tremblay, County of Chicoutimi; praying aid for the construction of Bridges over the Rivers Caribau and Valin.*

*Of Ingram Taylor and others, of the County of Kent; praying for certain amendments to the Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts for the formation of Joint Stock Companies for the construction of Roads and other works in Upper Canada.*

*Of Peter C. Blackburn and others, of the Township of Dawn; praying that a certain portion of the Township of Dawn, south of the line between lots numbers twenty and twenty-one, be united to the County of Kent.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of Kinloss, County of Bruce; praying that means may be adopted to cause the immediate settlement of all lands in the said Township, belonging to non-residents.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of Huron, County of Bruce; praying that Penetangore may be established as the County Town of the County of Bruce.*

*Of Thomas Kay and others, of the Town of Lindsay, County of Victoria; and of the Municipality of [the] Township of Ops, County of Victoria; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the separation of the Counties of Peterborough and Victoria, and that the Town of Lindsay may be erected into the County Town.*

*Of the Quebec Board of Trade; praying for the enlargement of the Locks on the Welland and Chambly Canals, for improving the Navigation of the Richelieu and the St. Lawrence, between the Lakes St. Lewis and St. Francis; for the building of Tidal Docks and additional Light-houses; for a Bonus to establish a Weekly Line of Steamers to Great Britain; for the dissemination abroad of correct information for Emigrants desirous of reaching the West via the St. Lawrence, and for the passing of an Act to establish direct Reciprocal Trade in products with any of the West India Islands desirous of doing so.*

*Of the Quebec Infant School; praying for aid.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of North Gower; praying that a Survey be made in order to ascertain the probable cost of opening a continuous line of water communication from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence, by the Valley of the Ottawa.*

*Of the Municipality of the Township of North Gower; praying for the passing of an Act to provide for the payment of Jurors out of the Consolidated Revenue.*

*Of the Montreal Savings' Bank; praying for certain amendments to the Act 4 and 5 Vic., cap. 32, to encourage the establishment of Savings' Banks.*

*Of Isaac Toussignant and others, Proprietors of vessels navigating the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal; praying for the passing of an Act to regulate the measuring of coal.*

(68)

*Of the Municipal Council of the Town or Borough of William Henry; setting forth that, as the Seigniority of Sorel belongs to Her Majesty's Ordinance, it does not come under the operations of the Seigniorial Act of 1854, as amended, whereby they are deprived of the advantages enjoyed by the Censitaires of other Seigniories, and the funds derived from Tavern licenses taken from them and paid into the fund for the redemption of Seigniorial dues, and praying that the moneys levied from Tavern licenses during 1855, be paid over to them as heretofore.*

*Of Mrs. Margaret Fraser, of the City of Ottawa; praying for aid in behalf of a Young Ladies' Seminary in the said City.*

*At the hour appointed, Mr. Speaker and the House attended upon His Excellency the Governor General with the Address of the House.*

*And being returned;<sup>3</sup>*

*Mr. Speaker reported, That the House had attended upon His Excellency with their Address in answer to the Speech of His Excellency to both Houses of the Legislature, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following answer:--*

*Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly,*

*I thank you for your loyal and dutiful Address, and I have every hope that your deliberations will promote the welfare of Canada.*

*On motion of MR. ALLEYN<sup>4</sup>,*

(68)

*Ordered, That the Petition of the Quebec Board of Trade be printed for the use of the Members of this House.*

*MR. J. SMITH, (Victoria), moved that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills, be extended till the 1st April.<sup>5</sup>*

*MR. J.S. MACDONALD, (Glengary), opposed the motion, on the ground that its tendency was to throw Private Bills to the end of the Session, when they were hurried through without proper consideration.<sup>6</sup> It would cause considerable delay in the Legislation, and would keep them then legislating till the month of August.<sup>7</sup>*

*MR. ROBINSON was astonished at the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite. It was well known that the time specified expired this day, and he would like to know what they had done the past fortnight but quarrelled with each other. Honorable members had had no time at all to attend such matters.<sup>8</sup>*

*MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that they had hitherto extended the time for these matters, and it was much better to make a reasonable limit, and let the country know that the time would be fixed a specified day, they would be prepared.<sup>9</sup>*

(68)

*On motion of Mr. James Smith, seconded by Mr. Joseph C. Morrison, Resolved, That the time fixed by the Rules of this House for receiving Petitions for Private or Local Bills be extended to the 1st day of April next.*

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,--Report of the Senate of the University of Toronto upon the complaints preferred against the Principal and Mathematical Master of Upper Canada College.*

*For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 6.)*

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier also presented,--Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 19th instant, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before the House, Copies of Correspondence and other Documents, having reference to the withdrawal from sale of certain lands situate in the County of Grey and Bruce; which lands were advertized to be sold on the 17th October, last; also, the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs.*

*For the said Return, see Appendix (Nos. 7 & 8.)*

*Ordered, That Mr. Loranger have leave to bring in a Bill to secure to Creditors attaching the effects of their Debtors, a privileged claim for their costs of suit upon the moneys arising from Judicial Sales.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*On motion of Mr. Charles Daoust, seconded by Mr. Prévost,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before the House, Copies of all instructions given by the Government to the Commissioners appointed to carry into operation*

(69)

*the Seigniorial Tenure Act of 1854, and of any correspondence on the subject between the Government and the said Commissioners.<sup>10</sup>*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Ferres have leave to bring in a Bill to repeal in part an Act to provide a remedy against the City of Quebec in case of injury to property by Riot.<sup>11</sup>*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

MR. J. SMITH (Victoria) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law providing for the indemnity of members of the Legislative Assembly.<sup>12</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE enquired whether it was now to be eight dollars or ten dollars a day? (Hear, hear.)<sup>13</sup>

MR. J. SMITH said the object of his Bill was simply to limit the number of days during which the members of the House should be paid their indemnity. He proposed to limit it to 100 days.<sup>14</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE.--The honorable gentleman should have put in a clause, that members should imitate my example and make short speeches. (Laughter.)<sup>15</sup>

(69)

*Ordered, That Mr. James Smith have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act 12 Vic. cap. 33, so that the per diem allowance to Members of the Legislative Assembly shall not continue for more than one hundred days in any Session.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

MR. CAMERON moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Law of Evidence in Upper Canada. The hon. gentleman briefly explained its provisions. One of its principal features was to allow plaintiffs and defendants to give evidence themselves, on their giving due notice to the opposite parties. But in cases where one of the parties could not be present, the evidence of the other could not be received as to matters within the knowledge of both. So also in cases, between any party and administrators or executors, where the evidence proposed to be given had been within the knowledge of the person deceased.<sup>16</sup> [OR] The object of the Bill was to relieve executors, administrators, guardians and trustees from the disability under which they now lay, in consequence of being incompetent to give witness in any matter within their jurisdiction, simply because they were interested so far as to the payment of the costs. The law at present excludes such parties from giving testimony.<sup>17</sup>

(69)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law of Evidence in Upper Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.*

*On motion of Mr. James Smith, seconded by Mr. Roblin,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will cause to be laid before this House, a Return, shewing in detail the parties and bodies with whom commutation has been made under the Provincial Statute, 18 Vic., cap. 2, sec. 3; the age of each party or incumbent, and the amount paid to them respectively, the date of commutation in each case, also the amount of stipend or allowance assigned or given to each party or body at the time of the passing of the Imperial Act, 16 Vic., cap. 21; and a statement of the manner in which such commutation may have been invested or appropriated; also the amount of the fund realized or to be realized from the sales of Clergy Reserve Lands already made, and the quantity of lands called Clergy Reserves remaining unsold on the 31st day of December last, in each section of the Province.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Bellingham have leave to bring in a Bill to erect part of the Township of Chatham, in the County of Argenteuil, into a separate Municipality.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Monday the tenth day of March next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Somerville have leave to bring in a Bill to establish a Circuit Court in and for the County of Huntingdon, and part of the County of Chateauguay.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.*

MR. A. DORION moved an Address to his Excellency for a statement respecting the monies set apart for the redemption of Seigniorial dues.<sup>18</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND ... [exprime] le consentement du gouvernement<sup>19</sup>.

(70)

*On motion of Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, seconded by Mr. Papin,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House:-- First, A Statement of the different sums of money placed to the credit of the special fund set apart to aid the Censitaires in the redemption of the Seigniorial dues, and to defray the expenses arising out of such redemption in virtue of the Seigniorial Tenures Act of 1854, and of the amendments made thereto in 1855, shewing the amounts, both capital and interest, derived from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province, and from the different sources of revenue mentioned in the 17th and 18th clauses of the Act of 1854. Secondly, A Statement of all the expenses incurred up to the first January, 1856, for salaries to the Commissioners, or for disbursements made by them, and also of all expenses arising out of the sessions of the Seigniorial Court, and from any other cause whatever, in conformity with the provisions of the Seigniorial Act of 1854, and the amendments of 1855. Thirdly, A Statement of all the sums of money which have been paid up to the first of February, 1856, to each proprietor of Fiefs or Seigniories in Lower Canada, shewing whether the sum so paid was for interest or the capital of the amount due them, and whether it was so paid on account or in full of their claims upon the Seigniorial Fund. Fourthly, The names of all the Seigniors who, up to the first of February, 1856, have produced certified statements of the amounts claimed by them for quint or lods et ventes, in conformity with the third clause of the Act of 1855, to amend the Act of 1854, and the amount claimed by each. Fifthly, The names of all persons who are or have been employed as Commissioners by the Commissioners to fill up the Schedule, or otherwise, in virtue of the provisions of the Seigniorial Act of 1854, and of the amendments thereto of 1855, the nature of their duties or occupation, and the amount of their Salaries, Fees, or Emoluments.<sup>20</sup>*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. CAMERON introduced a Bill to prevent the issue of Execution against the lands of testators or intestate persons without notice to the heirs or devisees. He observed that lands of testators are often sold without the knowledge of the parties interested. The object of his bill was to prevent this and to secure that no injury be sustained by the parties referred to.<sup>21</sup>

(70)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the issue of executions against the lands of Testators or Intestates, without notice to the Heirs or Devisees of such persons.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday the tenth day of March next.*

MR. C. DAOUST introduced a Bill to abolish the right of appeal to Her Majesty's Privy Council, in certain cases.<sup>22</sup>

MR. LORANGER called attention to the question whether a Colonial Legislature could repeal the right of appeal, which had been said by some to be an inherent right of the Crown.<sup>23</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, en réponse, dit qu'il s'était opposé, l'année dernière, à la passation de cette mesure, parce qu'il n'aimait pas une législation séparée sur des sujets de cette nature, mais que d'ailleurs il ne voyait aucune objection à ce bill; que le gouverneur était là pour veiller aux droits de sa majesté, et que du moment qu'il donnerait sa sanction à une pareille mesure, il ne pensait pas que la chambre dut avoir d'inquiétude à cet égard.<sup>24</sup> [He] said it was optional with the Imperial Government, who would receive the bill for correction, to say whether they would confirm any curtailment of the Royal prerogative.<sup>25</sup>

After a short discussion, the bill was read a first time.<sup>26</sup>

(70)

*Ordered, That Mr. Charles Daoust have leave to bring in a Bill to abolish the right of Appeal in Her Majesty's Privy Council in certain cases.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill for the suppression of Lotteries.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday the tenth day of March next.*

*On motion of Mr. Cooke, seconded by Mr. Somerville,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a copy of any correspondence which may have passed between the Imperial and Provincial Governments on the subject of the assumption by this Province of the*

(71)

*Canals, Lands, and other properties belonging to the Board of Ordnance in Canada.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. LORANGER moved for an Address to His Excellency, for a return relative to the cases which may have been lost in removing the Seat of Government from Quebec to Toronto.<sup>27</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD understood that several valuable documents belonging to the Crown Lands Office had been so completely obliterated by water as to be useless.<sup>28</sup>

MR. LORANGER thanked the hon. gentleman for the suggestion, and, with the permission of the House, added the following to his motion:—"And also for a statement of the archives that have been damaged, either in whole or in part, during the said translation."<sup>29</sup>

(71)

*On motion of Mr. Loranger, seconded by Mr. Desaulniers,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, in addition to the information already applied for in relation to the expenses incurred in the removal of the Seat of Government from Quebec to Toronto, a list of the cases containing archives and documents belonging to the Legislature and the Government, together*

*with a description of such documents as may have been lost in the course of removal from the Government offices at Quebec to those in Toronto, and also a statement of the documents which have been wholly or partially destroyed.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Laberge have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act 18 Vic., cap. 86, for better securing the independence of the Legislative Assembly in this Province.<sup>30</sup>*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.*

MR. BUREAU moved an address to his Excellency, for a financial statement relative to the Municipalities of Upper and Lower Canada.<sup>31</sup> [Il] observa que plusieurs municipalités dans le Haut-Canada avaient emprunté des sommes considérables dont elles ne payaient ni le capital ni les intérêts, que même l'une d'elle avait demandé à être déchargée d'une somme de 75 mille louis qu'elle devait et des intérêts accrus sur icelle; qu'il était temps de savoir si le gouvernement allait adopter quelques procédés à ce sujet.<sup>32</sup>

MR. BROWN stated that he had on the notice paper, a motion for the same end, which was much more comprehensive than that moved by the hon. gentleman. It was a motion for an addres[s] to His Excellency, for a return of all applications by Municipalities for loans from the Municipal Loan Funds of Upper and Lower Canada respectively, and the amounts thereof; also, shewing the Municipalities that have received loans from the said funds, and the amounts and objections of such loans, and setting forth what portions of the said loans have been refunded, and such portions as are past due but still unpaid. That motion was, he thought, much more to the purpose than that of the member for Napierville. His (Mr. Bureau's) did not embrace the number of applications by Municipalities for loans.<sup>33</sup>

This was incorporated with the motion, which then passed.<sup>34</sup>

(71)

*On motion of Mr. Bureau, seconded by Mr. Papin,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House:-- First, A Statement of the sums obtained by the Municipalities of Upper and Lower Canada, by virtue of the Act 16 Vic., cap. 22, distinguishing those Municipalities which have, to 1st January past, neglected to pay interest therefor at eight per cent., and those which have paid the interest and an instalment of the principal sum loaned to them, by other ways and means than those directed in the said Act. Second, Information relative to the revenue out of which, and the persons or corporations by whom the said interest and the said instalment of the principal, have been paid up to 1st January past. Third, A Statement of the Municipalities indebted for arrears, and of the amount of arrears due to the 1st January past. Fourth, A Statement of the objects for which the Loan was effected. Fifth, Information whether the objects in view were carried into effect or not. Sixth, A statement shewing the amount collected by taxation in any Municipality, for the purpose of paying the interest on the Loan granted to such Municipality, and the amount thereof paid over by such Municipality. Seventh, Also, a list of all applications by Municipalities for loans from the said Fund, and the amount thereof.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. J. DORION (Drummond) moved an Address to his Excellency for a detailed statement of the sums expended for the support of Common Schools in Upper and Lower Canada respectively for the year 1855.<sup>35</sup>

It was suggested that he should wait until the reports of the Superintendents were laid before the House.<sup>36</sup>

MR. J. DORION said he wanted the information immediately.<sup>37</sup> The hon. gentleman explained that his object was to put the House in possession of the facts sought at as early a period as possible, as the Reports of the Superintendents of Schools were usually delayed so long that they could not be made use of by the House during the session.<sup>38</sup> The House would want to discuss the subject of education before the reports were prepared.<sup>39</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY hoped it would not be printed at an unnecessary expense. Too much money was squandered in that way. Mr. Christie of Gaspé once moved for the printing of the Edits and Ordonnances. The vote had passed, as a matter of course, yet that had already cost the country 9,000L.<sup>40</sup> [He] stated his intention of asking the aid of the House in order to impose some check on the amount of printing done for the House.<sup>41</sup>

MR. A. DORION of Montreal thought the suggestion of last session that nothing should be printed except after examination and report of the printing committees, was a good one.<sup>42</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY hoped it would be acted on. Last session the printing bill amounted to 9,000L.<sup>43</sup> [He] hoped the committee on printing would devise some means of lessening the cost of it.<sup>44</sup>

MR. GALT complained of the extravagant amount expended in the printing of the house. Last session that amount reached the enormous sum of 20,000L. That outlay was not in a ratio with the amount of information received by the public.<sup>45</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND (East) agreed with the hon. gentlemen as to the extravagance of this expenditure. Many documents were printed at full length, of which only an abstract ought to have been given.<sup>46</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE had long since urged the necessity of a reduction in the Printing expenditure. There should be some new arrangement come to. The person who was responsible for doing the Printing of the House had not done his duty. Not even half of the appendixes of the proceedings of the House had yet been printed; and the other important documents, reports, &c., were also left unprinted. Why, he would ask, were not those documents now in their hands? Where were the Reports of the Committee on Railroads and Canals of last year? And, in fact, where were all the documents ordered to be printed? Some of these documents were of the most important character, and yet they had not been furnished with any one of them. If any of them had been printed, they had never been given out. If the good of the country were

consulted and not the profit of a few individuals, all these documents would have been long since placed before the House. What a contrast such a state of things presented to the way in which the business ought to be conducted, and is conducted in the States! There, if they receive Macaulay's England, or any work of moment, it is reprinted in a few days. Yet here it takes as many years to print documents of the utmost importance to the country. The 20,000L mentioned by the member for Sherbrooke as having been expended last year, would, if added to the expense of printing of the volumes which ought to have been in their hands then, and the printing of the Legislative Council, not fall far short of \$300,000! Such a state of things was a shame and disgrace to any country.<sup>47</sup>

MR. FERRES considered that the misfortune of it was, that the hon. member moved for the printing of the documents without knowing their contents, the expense it would entail on the country, or, in fact, anything at all about them. Such a state of things would be best remedied by making a rule that every document asked to be printed, should be first submitted to the Printing Committee, to decide whether it ought to be printed or not. Such an arrangement would economise the expenditure and obviate the necessity of printing a large amount of useless matter.<sup>48</sup>

MR. STEVENSON said there would be little difficulty in effecting a retrenchment, in this respect, if the member for Haldimand would give his aid to effect it.<sup>49</sup>

The original motion was agreed to.<sup>50</sup>

(71)

*On motion of Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion, seconded by Mr. Darche, Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, a Statement in detail of the sums paid for the support of Common Schools in Upper and Lower Canada, respectively, during the year 1855; and also, of the sums paid to aid in the erection of School Houses during the same year.*

(72)

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion have leave to bring in a Bill for the protection of Squatters in the Townships of Lower Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

On motion of MR. LORANGER,<sup>51</sup>

(72)

*Resolved, That a Select Committee, composed of Mr. Loranger, the Honorable Mr. Cartier, the Honorable Mr. Cameron, the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, Mr. Thomas Fortier, Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, and Mr. Brown, be appointed to revise and amend the Standing Rules and Orders of this House, to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.*

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the Chair at six o'clock.<sup>52</sup>

[After the recess,]

(72)

*Notice being taken that an Entry of the Journals of this House, of the twenty-third day of May last, in relation to the proceedings of this House on a Report of a Committee, contained the Title of a different Report to that which had been proceeded upon,*

MR. FERRES moved that the Entries of the 23rd May, 1855, in the journals of last session, be read, with the view of expunging therefrom that part which relates to the Select Committee to whom was referred the Petitions of John Maguire, of the City of Quebec, Esquire, and others, the same having been, through a clerical error, inserted in the said journals.<sup>53</sup>

(72)

*On motion of Mr. Ferres, seconded by Mr. Joseph C. Morrison,*

*Ordered, That the said Entry be now read; and the same being read, as followeth:--*

*"The House according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Report of the Special Committee, to which were referred the Petitions of John Maguire, of the City of Quebec, Police Magistrate; the Petition of Samuel Snell, of the City of London, England; the Petition of Jean Dion, of the City of Quebec, Pilot; and the Petition of William Wright and others, of the City of Quebec; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Papin reported, That the Committee had come to a Resolution; which was read, as followeth:--*

*"Resolved, That this House do concur in the Report of the Select Committee.*

*"The said Resolution, being read a second time, was agreed to."*

MR. FERRES then said he wished to induce the house to expunge the whole of that entry. The fact is a mistake, which must have been made by the Clerk, between the petition of Mr. Mackenzie, and the petition of Judge Power. The petition of Judge Power was referred to a select committee<sup>54</sup> in the same way as the other, and the statements in the journal reported to have taken place in the case of Mr. Maguire, actually took place in the case of Judge Power. It was evidently a clerical error, and he hoped the House would not object to the error being corrected. He therefore hoped that the words erroneously inserted in the journals of this House be expunged therefrom, and the words inserted: The House according to order resolved into committee on the Report of the Select Committee, on the petition of William Power, Esq., Circuit Judge, Quebec, and other reference, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the chair, and the clerk stated that this House had concurred in report of said committee, and said resolution being read a second time was agreed to.<sup>55</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that his attention having been drawn to the error in the journal, he was satisfied that the statements made by the hon. member were according to the minutes of the meeting at that time.<sup>56</sup>

The motion was agreed to, and the Journals corrected in the mode pointed out by the hon. member.<sup>57</sup>

(72)

*Ordered, That the words "Special Committee to which were referred the Petition of John Maguire, of the City of Quebec, Police Magistrate; the Petition of Samuel*

*Snell, of the City of London, England, Seaman; the Petition of Jean Dion, of the City of Quebec, Pilot; and the Petition of William Wright and others, of the City of Quebec;" be expunged, and the words "Select Committee to which were referred the Petitions of William Power, Esquire, of the City of Quebec, Circuit Judge, and other References," substituted instead thereof.*

This having been done,

MR. FERRES said he was at a loss now how to proceed.<sup>58</sup> The committee had not reported in the case of Mr. Maguire. They were desirous of proceeding with their investigation. But he understood they could not proceed without the matter was again brought before the House.<sup>59</sup> He did not know whether the investigation could be again gone into, without the petitions of last session being renewed.<sup>60</sup> He wished to know what course should be pursued.<sup>61</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the hon. member might move for a committee to enquire into the conduct of Mr. Maguire, the Police Magistrate of Quebec, and he might then move that the proceedings of the committee of last session be referred to that committee.<sup>62</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said, that their general rule in such a case was to have the journal read at the place referred to, and move the re-appointment of the committee accordingly.<sup>63</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said there was no doubt the course pointed out by the hon. member for Haldimand had sometimes been adopted, but it would be better of the hon. member to give notice of motion.<sup>64</sup>

MR. FERRES gave notice that he would move accordingly.<sup>65</sup>

DR. SOUTHWICK having moved "to add the name of the Hon. Mr. Spence to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines,"<sup>66</sup>

MR. FLINT asked what was the object of this, since there were already as many as five of the Ministers on this Committee, and moved that Mr. Foley's name should be substituted for Mr. Spence.<sup>67</sup>

DR. SOUTHWICK's reply was not audible in the Reporter's gallery.<sup>68</sup>

MR. A. DORION suggested that since five ministers were on this committee, they might as well commit the whole work to the Executive Council at once as to add more.<sup>69</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that the members of the Government had no desire to be placed upon such Committee as members of the Government<sup>70</sup>. Ministers were appointed as representing certain lines of railroad. The Postmaster General<sup>71</sup> residing in the neighborhood of the G.W. Railway at Dundas,<sup>72</sup> represents a section of the Great Western, and will be very assiduous in the discharge of the duties that may devolve upon him.<sup>73</sup>

MR. FREEMAN took an objection to such proposition, at least Mr. Spence could not be considered to represent the Southern line from Hamilton,<sup>74</sup> and remarked on the extraordinary mode of appointing committees adopted. Although Mr. Foley does not represent directly the interests of the people to whom the southern section of the

roads belongs, still he would be better qualified than the Postmaster General, by his knowledge of their wants to advance their interests.<sup>75</sup>

Dr. Southwick's address was finally carried without a division.<sup>76</sup>

(72)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Spence be added to the Standing Committee on Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines.*

MR. PATRICK moved for the appointment of a select Committee of fifteen members, with instructions to enquire as to the best means of suppressing the vice of drunkenness, and to report from time to time to this House--said Committee to consist of Messrs. Aikins, Chapais, Christie, Church, DeWitt, J.B.E. Dorion, Felton, Flint, Hartman, Jackson, Poulin, Sanborn, Taché, Wright, and the mover.<sup>77</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE objected to the motion<sup>78</sup>. [He] would have liked that the hon. member had added to his motion something about the beautiful rows of bottles down stairs. They should first remove the<sup>79</sup> whiskey, rum, brandy and gin bottles that were there set forth for the refreshments of the members and others.<sup>80</sup> Then they might talk about reforming the rest of the country. (Hear, hear.)<sup>81</sup>

(72)

*Resolved, That a Select Committee of fifteen Members, composed of Mr. Patrick, Mr. Aikins, Mr. Chapais, Mr. Christie, Mr. Church, Mr. DeWitt, Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion, Mr. Felton, Mr. Flint, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Poulin, Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Taché, and Mr. Wright, be appointed to inquire as to the best means of suppressing the vice of drunkenness; to report thereon from time to time, with power to send for persons, papers, and records.*

*On motion of Mr. Darche, seconded by Mr. Bureau,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, Copies of any correspond-*

(73)

*ence which may have taken place between the Government and the persons claiming the sum of Two Hundred and Fifty Pounds, voted in 1854 and 1855 to the Female Academy at Chambly, together with the names of the parties who received the said sum, and the date of the payment thereof.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. BOWES moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Separate School Act of 1855. The clause to which he referred provides that any rate payer of any municipality can, by going to the clerk of that municipality and giving notice that he is a Roman Catholic and prefers supporting separate schools, be exempted from the school tax. He wished to relieve the clerk of the municipality and the Trustees from the difficulty they now have with this clause. He had not the bill before him and would not give a full explanation of it. He hoped the house would allow the bill to be printed.<sup>82</sup> His object was to secure proper checks, which would secure that no rate-payer should be exempted from school taxation.<sup>83</sup>

MR. HARTMAN said it was rather difficult, from the explanation of the hon. member, to understand the exact nature of the amendment he was to introduce.<sup>84</sup> He would not enter into discussion until the bill was before them; but from what the

hon. gentlemen (sic) had said<sup>85</sup>, aside from the principle of the measure, he thought it would be utterly impossible, under our Municipal Law, to work it out.<sup>86</sup>

(73)

*Ordered, That Mr. Bowes have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the twelfth Section of the Separate School Act of 1855.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

DR. FRAZER moved for an address to his Excellency, for a return of the number of applicants for admission into the Toronto Lunatic Asylum as Lunatics, and the number whose application has been refused, from the want of the needful accommodation--the said return to embrace the last three years, and to show the number of Lunatics in the different gaols in Canada<sup>87</sup>. In bringing this motion forward, Mr. Fraser argued that it was a subject of very great importance to the Province generally, since it was a well-known fact that many applications were sent to the present Asylum from all parts of the Province, which had to be rejected, and at the same time there were daily applications at the Asylum, from whence the parties had to return, as it was rarely the case that they could gain admittance.<sup>88</sup>

(73)

*On motion of Mr. Frazer, seconded by Mr. Foley,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Return of the number of applicants for admission into the Toronto Lunatic Asylum as Lunatics, and the number whose application has been refused from the want of the needful accommodation, the said Return to embrace the last three years, and to shew the number of Lunatics in the different Gaols in Canada.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. HARTMAN moved an "address to his Excellency for copies of all contracts made by the department of Public Works with the Toronto Roads Company, or with any other Company or person in reference to the purchase of any of the macademized (sic) or other public roads in the County of York."<sup>89</sup>

MR. GOULD suggested, that Mr. Hartman should include the Whitby Harbour and other places under similar circumstances.<sup>90</sup>

MR. HARTMAN had no objection to accede to the wishes of the hon. member, but at the same time he thought it better that if any other papers were wanted they should be got separately.<sup>91</sup>

(73)

*On motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Aikins,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House; a copy of all contracts made by the Department of Public Works on behalf of the Government, with the Toronto Roads Company, or with any other Company or person in reference to the purchase of any of the Macadamized or other Public roads in the Counties of York and Peel.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. MATHESON, moved an Address to his Excellency, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, a return showing the actual sum or sums of money paid to the ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, or their authorised agent or agents, out of the Clergy Reserves Fund; during and for the year 1853.<sup>92</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE thought it better to include the other Churches, and also that the correspondence be had as the correspondence would show the principle upon which the Government gave that money.<sup>93</sup> [He] suggested, that as the Assembly had a portion of the correspondence of the government with these clergymen and their agents, sent them last session, it would be well to send for the rest of it at this time.<sup>94</sup>

MR. MATHESON declined to consent to any such amendment.<sup>95</sup> If Mr. McKenzie wished any such information, he might move for it in his own way.<sup>96</sup>

(73)

*On motion of Mr. Matheson, seconded by Mr. Lumsden,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, a Return shewing the actual sum or sums of money paid to the Ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, or to their authorized Agent or Agents, out of the Clergy Reserves Fund, during and for the year 1853.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Loranger, have leave to bring in a Bill to authorize the alienation in certain cases of certain portions of property charged with substitution.<sup>97</sup>*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

[On motion of] MR. J.S. MACDONALD<sup>98</sup>,

(73)

*Resolved, That a Select Committee composed of the Honorable John Sandfield*

(74)

*Macdonald, the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab, the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald, Mr. Taché, Mr. Laberge, the Honorable Mr. Cameron, Mr. Turcotte, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as Members of the Joint Committee of both Houses.*

*On motion of Mr. Rhodes, seconded by Mr. Price,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, a Statement of the Expense attending the arrests of sundry persons lately tried for murder in St. Sylvestre de Lotbinière, and for copies of all such Correspondence and other Documents as may be required to shew the circumstances under which the Montreal Water Police have been embodied during the present winter, the expense attending the same, the circumstances under which Her Majesty's Troops were employed in the above arrests, and the expenses incurred by the Province on their account.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Alleyn have leave to bring in a Bill to establish a Recorder's Court in the City of Quebec.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Alleyn have leave to bring in a Bill to encourage Ship building within this Province.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

MR. A. DORION, of Montreal, in the absence of Hon. J.H. Cameron, made a motion to reduce the Quorum of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, to five members.<sup>99</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE did not see any reason for the reduction. Hon. members ought to attend to the duty for which they were paid.<sup>100</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND approved of the motion.<sup>101</sup>

MR. BROWN would object to it. The committee was a very important one.<sup>102</sup>

(74)

*On motion of Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, seconded by Mr. Hartman,*

*Resolved, That the Quorum of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills be reduced to five Members.*

*On motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Freeman,<sup>103</sup>*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to his Excellency the Governor General, representing that the first and second Sections of the 12 Vic., cap. 200, intituled, "An Act to raise an income of One hundred thousand pounds out of the public lands of Canada, for Common School Education," enact that all moneys that shall arise from the sale of any of the public lands of the Province shall be set apart for the purpose of creating a capital, which shall be sufficient to produce a clear income of One hundred thousand pounds per annum, to form a Public School Fund; and that the said Fund shall not be alienated for any other purpose whatever; but shall be and remain a perpetual Fund for the support of Common Schools, and the establishment of Township and Parish Libraries; and praying that His Excellency will be pleased to direct the proper officer to lay before this House, as soon as practicable, a Return of the gross amount received annually from the sales of any of the public lands since the passage of said Act, in Upper and Lower Canada; also, representing to His Excellency, that by the third clause of the said Act; one million acres of land, as a special appropriation, the proceeds of which, after paying for*

(75)

*the management or sale thereof, with the amount of Indian annuities thereon, shall be applied towards creating the said Common School Fund; and praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Return of the gross amount received from the sale of those lands, the cost of management, and the amount of the Indian annuities charged against the said one million of acres; also, a*

statement shewing the number of acres sold, giving the average price per acre, the number of acres unsold, and the average price at which the land is now held, in order that the House may be placed in possession of all necessary information as to the amount to which the Common School Fund is entitled under the said recited Act.

*Ordered*, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

MR. JOBIN moved an Address to His Excellency, for a return of all sales of Seigniories subject to the payment of Quint on the mutation thereof, showing the amount of Quint paid, and, if not paid, why such payment has not been enforced?<sup>104</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said they could not lay the full infarmation (sic) before the House yet, because it had not been brought up.<sup>105</sup>

(75)

*On motion of Mr. Jobin, seconded by Mr. Valois,*

*Resolved*, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a Statement of all the Sales of Seigniories on which the Droit de Quint became payable in case of mutation, of the amount of the said Droit de Quint paid thereon, and if such payment has not been made, of the reason why it has not been exacted.

*Ordered*, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

*Ordered*, That Mr. Valois have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.

MR. POWELL moved for a select committee of five members to consider and report upon the petition of Joseph S. Lee, of Ottawa<sup>106</sup>--the lessee of the Music Hall, Quebec, at the time that building was taken possession of by the Government.<sup>107</sup>

(75)

*Resolved*, That the Petition of Joseph Smith Lee, of the City of Ottawa, be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Mr. Powell, the Honorable Mr. Robinson, Mr. Yeilding, Mr. Loranger, and Mr. Rankin, to examine the contents thereof, and to report thereon, with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

*On motion of the Honorable Mr. Young, seconded by Mr. Alleyn,*

*Resolved*, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, a Return of the number of the Vessels towed in each season by the Tug Boat Contractors below Quebec, since the commencement of the Contract, with a Statement of the name and tonnage of each ship, and the distance which the Tug Boats moved each vessel.

*Ordered*, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

Ordered, That Mr. Laberge have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act 18 Vic., cap. 104.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.

(76)

On motion of Mr. Hartman, seconded by Mr. Freeman,<sup>108</sup>

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House copies of all instructions, papers, or correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Provincial Authorities of this Province, on the subject of Reciprocal Trade between Canada and the other North American Colonies, the West India Islands, or Foreign Countries, together with copies of all correspondence which may have been communicated to His Excellency, between the Secretary of State, the Colonial Minister, and the Governments of Guiana, Barbadoes, or any of the West India Islands, on their commercial intercourse with Canada.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

On motion of Mr. Laberge, seconded by Mr. Bureau,

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a List of all claims made by Militiamen in Lower Canada for land, scrip, or pensions, since 1st March, 1850; specifying the name of the claimants, their places of residence, and the nature, amount, and grounds of their claims.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

[On motion of] MR. J. DORION<sup>109</sup>,

(76)

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to change the Tenure of the Indian Lands, in the Township of Durham, being read:

The Bill was accordingly read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the whole House, for Monday next.

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by Mr. Solicitor General Smith,

The House adjourned.<sup>110</sup>

APPENDIX: 28 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: ALEXANDER DALY.]

MR. DUFRESNE [gave notice that he would move an] Address to his Excellency for copies of all documents containing accusations against Alexander Daly, Esquire, Crown Land Agent for the County of Leinster, from the 1st of June, 1854, to the 1st of January, 1856, whether petitions, memorials, letters, or other documents, together with a list of the names of persons bringing forward such accusations, and also the replies, answers, or justification offered by the said A. Daly, to the said accusations; and, lastly, all the correspondence which has taken place during the above mentioned period between the Government and the said Alexander Daly, and any other persons, in relation to the conduct of the latter as a public officer.<sup>111</sup>

[NOTICE OF QUESTION RE: CHANGES IN THE TARIFF.]

MR. HOLTON ... [gave notice that he would make] an enquiry of the Ministry as to whether they intended proposing any changes in the Tariff during the present Session?<sup>112</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: REGISTRY LAWS.]

DR. MASSON enquired of the Ministry whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any measure in the present Ssssion (sic) to provide for the payment of Registrars and their Deputies, who have acted as Returning Officers under the "Municipal and Road Act of 1855?"<sup>113</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY replied that the Government were not yet prepared to give an answer.<sup>114</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that Registrars had been applied to for their accounts; till they obtained them they could not say what they should do.<sup>115</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: QUEBEC TURNPIKE ROADS.]

MR. POULIOT enquired of Ministers whether it is their intention to appoint a Commission to inquire into the allegations contained in the petition of the Municipal Council of St. Anselme, in Dorchester, presented to His Excellency in December last, complaining of the Turnpike Road Trustees, for the District of Quebec, with regard to the roads under their control, and especially that portion of them extending from Point Levi to St. Henri, not including that portion completed by Mr. Fournier, and what course the Government intend to pursue in the matter.<sup>116</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND replied it was not their intention to make such an inquiry.<sup>117</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: ANNUAL GRANT FOR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.]

MR. LABERGE enquired of Ministers, whether it was their intention to move for an increase of the provincial grant for elementary education, or for the creation of a special fund for that purpose?<sup>118</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND dit que ce sujet était sous la considération du gouvernement.<sup>119</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: LOWER CANADA MUNICIPAL ACT.]

MR. DUFRESNE asked whether it was the intention of the government to bring forward any amendments to the Lower Canada Municipal Act during the present year.<sup>120</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND stated that it was not the intention of the Government during this Session to bring in any amendments to the Municipality and Road Acts of 1855, for Lower Canada, except such as might be absolutely necessary to facilitate the operation of the Acts of last session<sup>121</sup>, and to correct some errors of the printer.<sup>122</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: LANDS GRANTED TO HEIRS OF W.B. FELTON IN ORFORD.]

MR. J. DORION inquired if Ministers had delayed the communication to this House of all the documents concerning the lands granted to W.B. Felton in the township of Oxford (sic), which information was prayed for by the House on the 7th March, 1855.<sup>123</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said he had been under the impression until a few days ago that they had been communicated long ago. The last of them had been copied, and the whole would be ready in a few days, perhaps in 24 hours.<sup>124</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.]

MR. SOMERVILLE [enquired of the Ministry] whether the Commissioners appointed on the part of the Government to investigate and determine upon the claims of parties who have sustained damages by the erection of the Dam at the head of the Beauharnois Canal have as yet reported, and if so, whether such claimants have been made aware of the respective amounts awarded, and when such amounts will be paid?<sup>125</sup> 2nd. Whether such claims remained unexamined, and if so, whether it is the intention of the Government now to cause a speedy examination of them to be made? 3rd. Whether parties dissatisfied with the decision of said commissioners will be offered an oppo[r]tunity [of] arbitration (sic) in pursuance of the Statute?<sup>126</sup>

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX said that Mr. Burroughs had completed what he had to do, sometime ago. The other Commissioner had not yet completed his report. There were still a certain number of claims unexamined, which would receive early attention. An opportunity of arbitration would be granted.<sup>127</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: BEACH AROUND MONTREAL.]

MR. YOUNG moved an Address to his Excellency, praying him to cause to be laid before the House, a copy of an opinion furnished by Sir L.H. Lafontaine, Bart., as to the right of the Crown to the Beach around the Island of Montreal.<sup>128</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said, that if the hon. gentleman needed a copy of that opinion, the Commissioner of Crown Lands would furnish him with it. But he (Mr. D.) did not think it necessary the opinion should be laid before the House.<sup>129</sup>

MR. YOUNG explained the circumstances under which that opinion was given, and thought it important enough to be printed.<sup>130</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND assured the hon. gentleman that if such were found to be the case, the document would be printed.<sup>131</sup>

On that understanding, [MR. YOUNG] ... withdrew his motion.<sup>132</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.]

MR. C. DAOUST (Beauharnois) moved an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, copies of any Report which may have been made by Sydney Bellingham, Esquire, member for the County of Argenteuil, since the last Session of Parliament, in relation to the damages caused to the lands bordering upon the two shores of Lake St. Francis, by the Dam constructed at the head of the Beauharnois Canal; and also, a statement of the expenses incurred, and the emoluments allowed to the said Sydney Bellingham for his services in so doing.<sup>133</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that Mr. Bellingham had not been employed on any such service.<sup>134</sup>

The motion was then withdrawn.<sup>135</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND ASYLUM.]

MR. FERRIE moved for an "Address to His Excellency, praying him to cause immediate steps to be taken for providing suitable accommodation for the deaf and dumb and the blind of this Province." He would wish to call the attention of the House to the want of proper accommodation that at present exists in this matter.<sup>136</sup> It was a disgrace to us that we had no such institution. 20,000L were voted in 1853<sup>137</sup> to get up an institution of this kind, and it was high time that it should be properly laid out. If they could not agree as to (sic) how it should be laid out, let them have institutions--one in each Province. In this Province, by the last census, there were 1,345 blind and deaf persons, and of that number 870 were blind. Here they had no place to put them in. In the United States they had 9,723 persons that were deaf and blind, and they had twelve institutions for them, and in the same proportion we ought to have two institutions.<sup>138</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that the honorable member should withdraw his motion, as the matter was now under consideration. The Government would shortly be in a position to declare their intentions as to the appropriation of the 20,000L.<sup>139</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE spoke in favor of such institutions. He could not conceive, after the setting apart of such a sum of money, why the provision had not been made for the Blind, the Deaf, and the Dumb.<sup>140</sup> [He] would like to know what right the Government had to delay so long and stand between the people, and their benevolent intentions expressed through Parliament. He lauded the institutions of this sort in New York which he had often visited.<sup>141</sup> He had himself been highly delighted with institutions for the instruction of such unfortunates, whose progress would well repay the labor bestowed, and it was astonishing how very quick the blind became conversant with music from the raised notes on pasteboard. The music he had listened to from such was quite enchanting, and often, while listening to it his very

veins were swelled with delight. Such an institution was provided for Lower Canada, called the Village of Industry, and he could not perceive why there should not be one too for Upper Canada.<sup>142</sup> He said it was the absence of such institutions in this country that prevented emigrants from coming here.<sup>143</sup> The hon. member for Waterloo deserves great credit for bringing this forward so frequently, but the stony heart of the Attorney General East has never melted, because the Institutions were likely to be built in Upper Canada.<sup>144</sup> He expressed the opinion that were the money to be expended exclusively in Montreal and Quebec, the Asylums would have been provided long ago.<sup>145</sup>

MR. FERRIE, after the statement of the Attorney General, withdrew his motion.<sup>146</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: SALARY OF CHIEF JUDGE EDWARD BOWEN.]

MR. LORANGER moved ... for a Committee of the Whole on the subject of arrears of salary due the Honorable Edward Bowen, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Lower Canada.<sup>147</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND opposed the motion, as it involved a money payment. In addition to this, he said the Government had already considered the subject, and were of opinion that there was no just grounds for the claim.<sup>148</sup>

[The] motion [was] lost.<sup>149</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE CROWN LANDS DEPARTMENT.]

The next question was a motion by the Hon. John S. Macdonald for an<sup>150</sup> Address to His Excellency for copies of any Orders in Council, and of any notice or orders signed by the Commissioner of Crown Lands since the first day of January, 1855, having reference to any change in the system which formerly permitted the public to have direct access to books, maps and papers, connected with the Crown Timber Land Department.<sup>151</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said, in consequence of the absence of the Commissioner of Crown Lands he would not press that motion at present.<sup>152</sup>

MR. POWELL, who had a similar notice on the paper, also expressed his willingness to let it stand over, but mentioned that it was very inconvenient for him to have to do so. Several gentlemen who had come some hundreds of miles were obliged to remain in Toronto at great inconvenience on account of his declining to have any communication with the Crown Lands Department under the present regulations, until they should receive the sanction of the House.<sup>153</sup>

MR. HOLTON<sup>154</sup> [OR] MR. MURNEY thought the hon. gentleman should press his motion and let the Government answer it. If this House had the control of public officers, they should speak their minds faithfully.<sup>155</sup> [He] referred to the general dissatisfaction expressed out of doors in reference to this department. He said he would be sorry to say anything at all to injure the feelings of the gentlemen at the head, but he thought that Government<sup>156</sup> should be prepared to come down and give a reply at once, even although the person at the head of that particular department did not happen to be present. He held the doctrine<sup>157</sup> and it was a sound one that if the duty of any of the departments are ill performed, every gentleman of the

Administration was equally responsible with the head of that department. He had not the same delicacy, therefore, as other hon. members, in asking information upon this subject.<sup>158</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER here called the hon. gentleman to order, and stated that the motion not having been pressed there was nothing before the chair.<sup>159</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: GENERAL ELECTION OF 1854.]

MR. PAPIN moved an Address to His Excellency, praying him to cause to be laid before this House a List showing:--

1. The names of the Returning Officers for the General Election of 1854, who made to the Government the Returns required by the 66th Section of the 12 Vic., c. 27, and who annexed thereto all the necessary vouchers.

2. Of the Returning Officers for the said General Election who made to the Government Returns without annexing thereto all the necessary vouchers.

3. Those Returning Officers who did not make such Returns.<sup>160</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND requested his hon. friend to allow that motion to stand over for some time.<sup>161</sup> [He] stated that a commission had been appointed to enquire into this matter. Not into all the items, but into those wherein it had been found, in the course of the Archambault investigation, that over-charges were likely to be made in construction, mileage, hustings, rent of places for holding elections, and pay of constables. In some cases, improper charges had been made, but in others there were none.<sup>162</sup> The whole of the papers connected with that election had been referred to those gentlemen connected with the Government, the Solicitor General, East, the Clerk of the Peace of Montreal, and the Supervisor of Customs of Lower Canada, for examination (sic). He was desirous that this information should come before the House, but it could not come so fully until these gentlemen have reported. The papers connected with the enquiry must be laid before this House before long, and the Report will show what kind of enquiry these gentlemen were requested to make, and would show that it is very inconvenient, if not impracticable, to give the statements which are desired at present. In order to show the nature of the accounts sent in, he would state that a charge for the erection of hustings is made, in many instances, where no hustings were constructed. In another instance, where a charge is made for mileage by one of the Returning Officers, it would have been necessary for that officer to have travelled 3,750 miles during that election in order to make his charge agree with the mileage allowance of the Act.<sup>163</sup> The Commission did not arraign the Registrars as criminals, but called upon them for explanations. This course had already led to several resignations, perhaps it would lead to more but, in addition, any found to have obtained public money improperly should be made to disgorge. The powers of the Commission extended to all Canada. He made this explanation because Government had been attacked, and he (Mr. D.) personally, with particular severity, for the dismissal of one of the officers guilty of the errors alluded to.<sup>164</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said if the hon. gentleman entered into an explanation now, to show to what extent (sic) Government had been defrauded by the Returning Officers, and to show why that information should not be given now, other gentlemen would have the right to show why this information should be given at the present moment.<sup>165</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND wished simply to show that these accounts were in the hands of the public officers for examination. They had been styled a commission solely

for the purpose of enabling them to take evidence. The object of the enquiry is, amongst other things, to ascertain who are the Returning Officers whose accounts appear.<sup>166</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER could not allow the discussion to go on, because the honorable gentleman had signified his intention to allow the matter to lie over. Other members will claim the liberty of addressing the House.<sup>167</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said his object was to induce the hon. gentleman to postpone this enquiry at present, because these witnesses cannot be obtained at the present moment,--but by postponing it, the House will obtain more full[y] any satisfactory information.<sup>168</sup>

MR. PAPIN having agreed to the delay, the matter was postponed at the request of the government.<sup>169</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.]

MR. C. DAOUST moved an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House a copy of the Report of A. Larue, Esq., concerning the damage occasioned by the Dam at the head of the Beauharnois Canal.<sup>170</sup>

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX prayed him to defer it until the report was completed; it was not now complete.<sup>171</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST consent [à la demande].<sup>172</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.]

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that he had stated to the House last night that he would ask the Government to fix a day for the consideration of the motion of which he had given notice as follows:--For the reading of the entries in the Journals of this House in 1849, which relate to the Address of this House to His Excellency, and the reply thereto, on the subject of convening Parliament alternately at Toronto and Quebec, with a view to the adoption of a resolution declaring the expediency of further continuing that system.<sup>173</sup> He had called the attention of the House last night to the necessity for a day being set apart for the purpose of discussing that subject. If the Government were now prepared to fix a day for the debate, he would postpone it, as he thought it would be well that sufficient notice should be given to allow an opportunity to every member to be present and lend his aid in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion as to whether the alternate system should or should not be continued. He considered it was the bounden duty of the House to take up the question at once, and quiet the mind of the country by putting an end to a system which had been generally condemned out of doors.<sup>174</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND was desirous that a day should be fixed for this subject, but unfortunately both the Premier and the Commissioner of Crown Lands were ill, and were unable to attend the Council today, and he was unwilling to fix any day in the absence of these gentlemen.<sup>175</sup>

MR. HOLTON<sup>176</sup> [OR] MR. MURNEY.--Will the Government take it up as a Government question?<sup>177</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, the Government were asked to name a day for the House to take up this question, and for the reasons he had given no day was yet fixed.<sup>178</sup>

MR. HOLTON [OR MR. MURNEY].--That is not an answer to my question.<sup>179</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--The Government will merely fix the day. The hon. gentleman knows, however, that the gentlemen who are in favour of a permanent Seat of Government will be sustained by those members of the Government who entertain the same views. I am as anxious as any could be to have a day for the discussion fixed, but should be sorry by doing so to be guilty of an act of discourtesy to the Premier and the Commissioner of Crown Lands. I hope to be able tomorrow, on behalf of the Government, to state a day, and if not let the House fix it.<sup>180</sup>

The notice was then allowed to stand over.<sup>181</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: EDUCATION IN LOWER CANADA.]

Les résolutions de M. A.A. Dorion relativement à l'éducation furent remises à lundi.<sup>182</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE RE: LOWER CANADA SCHOOL ACT.]

MR. SOMERVILLE having moved for the appointment of a Committee, composed of Messrs. Chapais, Dessaulniers, Bureau, J.B.E. Dorion, Terrill, Sanborn, and the mover, to inquire into the working of the Lower Canada School Act, with power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to report therein, by bill or otherwise, drew the attention of the House to the great necessity for an enquiry into the state of education in Lower Canada,--a fact evidenced by the long speeches on the subject already made. He believed there was not a L. Canada member in the House, who would say, that the present laws were working well. All would affirm that they required material amendments.<sup>183</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER said, in reply, he would inform the hon. member for Huntingdon that if he would consent to withdraw his motion, his wishes would be fully met by the information which the Government were preparing, and which would be laid before the House in a few days. The whole of the information sought would be in the hands of each member, from the Report of the Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada and the Report of the Inspector of Schools in Lower Canada, and which will be printed in March.<sup>184</sup>

The motion was then withdrawn.<sup>185</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER requested the hon. gentleman to postpone his motion for about a fortnight, when by that time they would have the report of the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada<sup>186</sup> for 1855,--an instance of despatch in this regard, he believed, which had never before occurred in our legislative annals.<sup>187</sup> That report was now in the hands of the printers, and when it was laid before the House the hon. gentleman would see that there was no necessity for the motion of enquiry.<sup>188</sup>

[MR. SOMERVILLE] agreed to ... postpone his motion<sup>189</sup>.

[POSTPONED ENQUIRY RE: ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY PASSED IN 1855 RELATIVE TO  
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.]

MR. CAMERON enquired of the Ministry, whether any and what answer has been received to the Address of this House to Her most Gracious Majesty on the subject of the removal of certain disabilities under which the Church of England laboured in this Colony?<sup>190</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said he had intended to have had a previous consideration with the hon. gentleman on the subject. He would be able in a day or two to give a more satisfactory reply than he could at present.<sup>191</sup>

The enquiry was accordingly postponed.<sup>192</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 28 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, offers the following commentary on today's proceedings in the House: "After a storm all know how pleasant and refreshing is a calm.... So after the explosion of Tuesday night, and the lamentable debate of yesterday carried on with a constrained civility, reaching the very verge of a new gulf of invective, the quiet, calm, civility and good nature which characterised to-day's proceedings are most refreshing. The notices of motion which previous to-day had gone on swelling to astonishing proportions without being touched, were taken up, and the business of the session actually began.... It was not until four o'clock that the notice list was reached, and in two hours nearly three of its seven pages were gone through. Eleven bills were introduced and read a first time, several inquiries put and answered, and a variety of addresses for returns ordered."
- LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, also reports: "Cette séance a été vraiment consacrée aux affaires; il y a eu peu de discours et beaucoup de besogne. La liste contenant sept pages d'avis de motions a été vidée complètement".
2. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), differs from the JOURNALS and reports only one petition from John Chester and others. As the second petition reported by the JOURNALS is not later read in the House, one can presume that the information was mistakenly repeated. However, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, reports the first petition is from "John Christie and others".
3. According to Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856), TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, and MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, the Address was presented to His Excellency the Governor General at half past three o'clock. Furthermore, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, adds: "At five minutes past four o'clock, the Speaker again took the Chair".
4. Telegraph (MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT, 1 March 1856).
5. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
6. IBID.
7. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
8. IBID.
9. IBID.
10. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, both add the following clause: "... together with a statement of the expenditure to this date under the authority of the said Act."
11. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), reports a better description of this Bill, as follows: "Mr. Ferres moved for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal in part an Act passed in the 16th year of her Majesty's Reign, intituled 'An Act to provide a remedy against the Corporation of the City of Quebec in case of injury to property by any mob, or during riots in the said City.' "
12. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
13. IBID.
14. IBID.
15. IBID.
16. IBID.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
18. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
19. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
20. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, reports six parts to the Address, the added clause being: "Le nom des seigneurs dont les cadastres ont été complétés". This newspaper

also adds the following comment: "Ces informations auront l'effet de faire connaître où en est rendu le règlement de cette importante question, quels sont ceux qui ont intérêt à faire prolonger les procédés, et surtout de donner une idée des sommes d'argent qui seront dépensées et de celles qui resteront pour venir en aide aux censitaires".

21. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
22. IBID.
23. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856).
24. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856. This newspaper also adds the following short comment on Mr. Loranger's reaction to Mr. Drummond's statement: "Le député de Laprairie ne put entendre ces remarques ... sans faire une grimace qui trahit son dépit."
25. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
26. IBID.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. IBID.
30. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, and Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856), specify the proposed Bill is to amend the 2nd Section of the said Act.
31. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
32. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
33. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
34. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
35. IBID.
36. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
37. IBID.
38. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
39. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
40. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), concurs with the cost of 9,000L reported in the Montreal Gazette. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, reports "Mr. Cayley admitted ... that the printing of the Edicts and Ordinances ... had cost the country thirty-six thousand Spanish dollars." It further comments: "Are they worth to Canada as many cents? Was not the whole affair a vile and scandalous job, to enrich pet printers and their sleeping political partners?"
41. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
42. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
43. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. The amount of 9,000L quoted by this newspaper seems quite improbable compared to the information given in footnote 40. It also differs greatly from the amount presumably given by Mr. Galt, whose speech follows.
44. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
45. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, reports "Mr. Galt assured the House that bills had already come in for \$104,000 of the Assembly's printing for 1855."
46. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
47. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, reports the following commentary: "Mr. Mackenzie, when on the printing committee, in 1852, had worked hard to reduce the cost. He had placed before the Legislature a bill to regulate the whole public printing, binding, paper buying, and Canada Gazette printing, that would have saved \$150,000, or at least \$100,000 a year--but the Hinckses, Macnabs, Morins, and their French

followers, had swamped his measure in three parliaments; all he could succeed in was to change the shape of the books from large folio to octavo. Government would do nothing but increase their own salaries and patronage. The whole of the Assembly's printing and binding for 1855 may come to \$200,000; then there are the like bills for those useless drones the Legislative Council; and the King's Printers, a couple of regular sharks, with the other printers and binders for the public offices--total \$400,000, or nearly that amount. Half they do is a waste of money.... The last sheet of printed proof of the appendix to last session's journals--12 or 13 heavy volumes--was sent to the printer at Toronto before the House met--then the immense load was sent down to Quebec to be bound, as if it couldn't be done at Toronto--then the whole load of heavy volumes will be sent up again to Toronto--1100 miles in all--none knows when!--all at government expense! 'Honesty is the best policy' may be true elsewhere. It is false here. Knavery is the road to fame, honor, and competence."

48. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
49. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
50. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
51. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856).
52. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
53. IBID.
54. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
55. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
56. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 1 March 1856.
57. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
58. IBID.
59. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
60. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
61. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
62. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
63. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
64. IBID.
65. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
66. IBID.
67. IBID.
68. IBID.
69. IBID.
70. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
71. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
72. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
73. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
74. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
75. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
76. IBID.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
78. IBID.
79. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
80. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
81. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
82. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856. In a commentary, GLOBE, 7 March 1856, reports the text of the Bill, as follows:

" 'Whereas it is expedient to remove certain impediments found to exist in the working of the Upper Canada Separate School Act of 1855. Therefore Her Majesty, &c, enacts as follows:--

'I. The twelfth section of the said Act shall be, and the same is hereby repealed.

'II. Notwithstanding anything in the above named Act, or in any other School Act or Acts to the contrary, every person paying rates, whether as proprietor or tenant, who, when required to pay his School taxes or rates, shall present to the Collector a certificate in duplicate from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Trustees or of any Board of Trustees of any Roman Catholic Separate School or Schools, that he has paid all School rates or taxes required by such Trustees or Board for the then current year, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates or taxes imposed for the building or support of Common Schools, or Common School Libraries, for the same year; and it shall be the duty of such Collector to retain one of the above named certificates, and sign his name to the other to be returned by him to the rate payer.

'III. This Act shall take effect from the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.'

"The 12th section of the Act of 1855 proposed to be repealed by the above 1st clause, is as follows:--

'Every person paying rates, whether as proprietor or tenant, who, on or before the first day of February of any year, shall have given notice to the Clerk of the Municipality in which any separate School is situated, that he is a Roman Catholic and a supporter of such separate School, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed within such ward or school section for the support of Common Schools and of Common School Libraries for the year then next following; and every Clerk of a Municipality, upon receiving any such notice, shall deliver a certificate to the person giving the same to the effect that such notice has been given, and showing the date of such notice; but any person who shall fraudulently give any such notice, or shall wilfully make any false statement therein, shall not secure any exemption thereby, but shall, on the contrary, be liable to a penalty of ten pounds currency, recoverable with costs, before any Justice of the Peace at the suit of the Municipality interested: Provided always that nothing herein contained shall exempt any such person from paying any rate for the support of Common Schools or Common School Libraries, or for the erection of a School-house or School-houses, which shall have been imposed before such Separate School was established.' "

83. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).

84. IBID.

85. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.

86. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856). In its commentary, GLOBE, 7 March 1856, reports the following opinion: "Mr. Bowes's Bill is a modest Bill. Thanks to the vigorous assaults of the Opposition, and still higher thanks to the removal of the seat of Government--the Roman School Bill of 1856 is very far beneath the pretensions of the Hierarchy last year.... Bishop Mary [de Charbonnel] is wise in his generation; he sees what is passing before him; he feels that the hour to strike a grand blow is not now; so he contents himself this season with a less startling demand, and selects as his tool a man suitable for the occasion. Mr. Bowes's Bill is a short Bill, and points at but one object--the collection of the Separate School tax; but it is fraught with evil and should be resisted with all energy.... It will at once be seen that these changes are calculated to be most injurious to the working of the School system; that it will greatly embarrass the collectors in getting in the assessments--that it will prevent all correct calculations, beforehand, as to the nett (sic) proceeds of any tax imposed--and that it will open a wide door for the fraudulent avoidance of all School taxation. We sincerely hope it may be thrown out."

In a commentary, MONTREAL WITNESS (reprinted in GLOBE, 19 March 1856), notes that "either owing to that gentleman's [Mr. Bowes'] inability to express his meaning, or else to a studied concealment of real intention, it was difficult to form a distinct notion of what the object of his Bill was. The Globe says that he is bringing it forward merely as the tool of Bishop Charbonnel, but most assuredly, after the late Pastoral, Protestants will be stupid indeed who allow themselves to be hoodwinked on this question in any manner or by any person whatever."

87. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
88. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
89. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
90. IBID.
91. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
92. IBID.
93. IBID.
94. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
95. IBID.
96. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
97. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 18 March 1856, reports the text of the Bill, as follows:

"Whereas the Law of Lower Canada does not afford to creditors attaching the effects of their debtors, any privilege upon the moneys arising out of judicial sales in civil proceedings, for reimbursement of their costs of suit, and in cases of the insufficiency of the proceeds of such sales paid into Court, the absence of such privilege is injurious to them: Therefore Her Majesty, &c., enacts as follows:

"I. In every case of the distribution of moneys being the proceeds of a judicial sale of real or personal estate, paid into any civil Court in Lower Canada, the creditors attaching such property shall hereafter have a privilege over all their other creditors, for their costs of suit over and above the cost of execution, and shall be collocated accordingly."
98. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
99. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
100. IBID.
101. IBID.
102. IBID.
103. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, reports this Address was moved by Mr. Hartman, "in the absence of Mr. Merritt".
104. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
105. IBID.
106. IBID.
107. IBID.
108. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, reports this Address was also moved by Mr. Hartman, "in the absence of Mr. Merritt".
109. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
110. Both Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856), and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856, report the House adjourned at half-past nine.
111. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
112. IBID.
113. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
114. IBID.
115. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856).
116. IBID.
117. IBID.

118. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
119. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
120. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
121. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
122. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
123. IBID.
124. IBID.
125. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
126. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
127. IBID.
128. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
129. IBID.
130. IBID.
131. IBID.
132. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
133. IBID.
134. IBID.
135. IBID.
136. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
137. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
138. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
139. IBID.
140. IBID.
141. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
142. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
143. IBID.
144. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
145. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
146. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
147. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
148. IBID.
149. IBID.
150. IBID.
151. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
152. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
153. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
154. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
155. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
156. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
157. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
158. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
159. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
160. IBID.
161. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
162. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
163. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
164. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856. In LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, the correspondent writes: "Je pense que le rideau levé par M. Papin durant la dernière session, va mettre à découvert bien des hommes qui ont profité de la négligence coupable du gouvernement à examiner leurs comptes, pour extorquer les deniers publics. Peut-être aussi que la découverte de cet abus conduira à celle de beaucoup d'autres qui se pratiquent sur une grande échelle dans un grand nombre de départemens publics."

165. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
166. IBID.
167. IBID.
168. IBID.
169. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
170. IBID.
171. Telegraph (MORNING CHRONICLE, 29 February 1856).
172. L'AVENIR, 7 March 1856.
173. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
174. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
175. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
176. IBID.
177. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
178. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
179. IBID.
180. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
181. IBID.
182. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856.
183. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
184. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
185. IBID.
186. IBID.
187. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 1 March 1856.
188. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 29 February 1856.
189. Scrapbook Hansard (28 February 1856).
190. IBID.
191. IBID.
192. IBID.

FRIDAY, 29 FEBRUARY 1856.

(76)

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House,--Accounts of the Trustees of the Montreal Turnpike Roads, to first December, 1855.

For the said Accounts, see Appendix (No. 9.)

Also, Returns from the Registrars of the Counties of Haldimand and Lincoln, pursuant to the Act 16 Vic., cap. 187, sec. 9, for the year 1855.

For the said Returns, see Appendix (No. 3.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Roderick McDonald,--The Petition of W. Nullanby and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

By Mr. Lumsden,--The Petition of Sylvanus W. Sharrard and others, of the Township of Pickering, County of Ontario.

By Mr. Bell,--The Petition of Donald Campbell and others, of the Township of Drummond, County of Lanark.

(77)

By Mr. Laporte,--The Petition of the Reverend A.F. Truteau, Vicar General, and others; and the Petition of the Reverend J.B. Drapeau, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Longue Pointe, District of Montreal.

By Mr. Freeman,--The Petition of the Independent Order of Good Templars, of the City of Hamilton, County of Wentworth; and the Petition of the Hamilton Division, No. 25, of the Sons of Temperance.

By Mr. Rhodes,--The Petition of Cornelius Krieghoff, of the City of Quebec.

By Mr. Hartman,--The Petition of William Harvey and others, of the Township of Malahide, County of Elgin; the Petition of Isaac Rose and others, of the Township of Williamsburg[h], County of Dundas; the Petition of Leonard Willcox, of the City of Toronto; and the Petition of Josiah Purkiss and others, of the Village of Thornhill, County of York.

By Mr. Holton,--The Petition of the Protestant Board of School Commissioners, of the City of Montreal.

By Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion,--Two Petitions of A. Stein and others, of the Village of St. Christophe d'Arthabaska.

By the Honorable Mr. Cartier,--The Petition of the Reverend P.M. Mignault, Curé of Chambly; the Petition of the Corporation of the College of Chambly; the Petition of the Corporation of the College Masson, in the Parish of Terrebonne, County of Terrebonne; the Petition of the Reverend L. Turcotte, Curé, and others, School Commissioners (sic) and others, of Ste. Philomène, County of Chateauguay; Two Petitions of Pierre Guibord, Mayor and others, of the Parish of St. Paul, County of Joliette; two Petitions of the Reverend A. Manseau, Curé, and others, School Commissioners of the Village of L'Industrie, County of Joliette; the Petition of the School Commissioners of the Municipality of Ste. Philomène, County of Chateauguay; and the Petition of the Corporation of the Montreal Asylum for aged and infirm women and orphans.

By Mr. Solicitor General Ross,--The Petition of the Reverend L. Proult and others, of the County of Beauce.

By Mr. Scatcherd,--The Petition of Robert Bond and others, of the Township of Caradoc, County of Middlesex.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of Donald Grant and others, of the Township of Oro, County of Simcoe; the Petition of Henry A. Hardy and others, of the Town of Brantford; the Petition of A. Raymond and others, of the Township of Orillia and vicinity,

County of Simcoe; and the Petition of Mrs. Mary Clarke and others, of the Township of Clarke, County of Durham.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--Two Petitions of the Municipality of the Township of Brant, County of Bruce.<sup>1</sup>

By the Honorable Mr. Spence,--The Petition of Absalom Shade and others, Merchants, Manufacturers, and others, of the Village of Galt and surrounding Country, County of Waterloo.

By Mr. James Smith,--The Petition of the Sons of Temperance, No. 219, Lindsay Division, in the Township of Ops, County of Waterloo (sic).

By Mr. Evanturel,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the Parish of Ste. Foye, District of Quebec.

By Mr. Loranger,--The Petition of the Sisters of St. Joseph, of the City of Toronto.

By Mr. Casault,--The Petition of the Reverend Z. Sirois and others, of the Township of Montminy, Parish of St. Pierre; and the Petition of Thomas Simard and others, Branch Pilots, for and below the Harbor of Quebec.

By Mr. Papin,--The Petition of the Reverend Féréol Dorval and others, of Village and Parish of L'Assomption.

By Mr. Southwick,--The Petition of Robert Michael and others, of the East Riding of the County of Elgin.

(78)

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of Peter Gibbons and others, Creditors of the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company; praying that no power may be granted to the said Company, to transfer by sale or otherwise, the said Line of Railway, until their claims against the said Company are adjusted and satisfied.

Of William Hampton, Senior and others, of the Township of Crowland; praying that no alteration may be made in the present established line, between the Third and Fourth Concessions of the said Township.

Of the Provisional Municipal Council of the County of Welland; praying for the passing of an Act, to disunite the Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

Of Robert Cathcart and others, of the Township of Clarke; praying that no alteration may be made in the Eighth Concession Line of the said Township.

Of the Municipal Council of the Parish of St. Etienne de la Malbaie, County of Charlevoix; praying aid to build a Bridge across the River Murray, in the Village of Nairne, in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend L. Provancher, Curé, and others, School Commissioners of the Municipality of St. Tite des Caps, County of Montmorency; praying for aid.

Of La Communauté des Révérendes Soeurs de la Charité de l'Hôpital Général de Bytown; praying for aid.

Of Henry Augustine Fitzgerald McLeod, of the City of London, County of Middlesex, Civil Engineer; praying for the passing of an Act to enable him to practise the profession of a Provincial Land Surveyor.

Of William Leonard, late Schoolmaster in the Town of New Carlisle, County of Bonaventure; praying for arrears of Salary due him as such Schoolmaster.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Binbrook; praying for certain amendments to the Municipal Law of Upper Canada.<sup>2</sup>

Of Thomas Parke, of Port Colborne; praying that the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company may be allowed to extend their Road to Port Colborne.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Oxford; praying that no Act may be passed which will interfere with the Charter or interests of the Woodstock and Lake Erie Railway and Harbour Company.

Of Charles Powell and others, of the Township of Delaware, and of the Municipality of the Township of Delaware; praying for the passing of an Act to provide for the settlement of the disputed lines in the said Township, according to the Survey and plan of Samuel Peters, Provincial Land Surveyor.

Of George Samuel Wilkes, of the Town of Brantford; praying for the passing of an Act to vest in him certain original allowances for Roads in Holmedale.

Of J.A. Wilkes and others, of the County of Brant; praying for an Act of Incorporation, under the name of "The Brant County Bank."

Of John H. Moore and others, of Brantford; praying for an Act of Incorporation, under the name of "The Canadian Life and Fire Insurance Company."

Of R.A. Chute and others, of the Township of Bosanquet and vicinity; of J.B. Mowat and others, of the Town of Niagara; of Gilbert Palen and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; of Lewis Card and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; of Philinda Peters and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; of Edwin C. Packard and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; of John N. Wilson and others, of the Township of Haldimand, County of Northumberland; of Causland Bothwell and others, of the Township of Drummond, County of Lanark; and of John Hunt and others, of the Township of King; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of James Stewart, of the City of Hamilton, Iron founder; setting forth, that he is proprietor of Twenty-five thousand pounds of paid-up Stock, in the Buffalo,

(79)

Brantford and Goderich Railway Company; and praying that no Act may be passed giving the said Company power to lease or sell the said Railroad, without providing for the security of his stock; and further, that he may be heard by Counsel.

Of William Weller, of the Town of Cobourg, and others; praying for an Act of Incorporation, under the name of the "International Telegraph Company."

Of James Cockburn and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; praying that the Act passed during last Session, to confirm a Survey of the line between the Sixth and Seventh Concessions in the Township of Hamilton, may be repealed.

Of Geoffry Hawkins, of the City of Toronto; of Henry Spencer Papps, of the City of Hamilton; and of Benjamin Walker, of the City of Toronto, Gentlemen; praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Chancery in Upper Canada, to admit them to practise as Attorneys and Solicitors therein, respectively.

Of George Hughes and others, of the Township of Wellesley, County of Waterloo; praying that the price of the Clergy Reserve Lands in the said Township may not be increased.

Of P.C. Van Brocklyn, of the Town of Brantford, County of Brant, on behalf of himself and others; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of "The Canada and Liverpool Mining Company."

Of the Roman Catholic Institute of St. Rochs, Quebec; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend F. Boucher, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St. Ambroise de la Jeune Lorette; praying that the Road called "la Route de la Misère," may be macadamized.

Of the Asylum of the Good Shepherd, of Quebec; praying for aid.

Of the Corporation of the College of Monnoir, County of Rowville; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend J.A. Provencal, Curé of St. Cesaire, District of Montreal; praying aid for the erection of a Female Educational Establishment in the Parish of St. Cesaire.

*Of Ira Schofield, late Captain in the Second Regiment of Leeds Militia, during the War of 1812; praying to be allowed half-pay for services rendered during the last War.*

*Of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo; praying for the passing of an Act, authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company, to lease their Road; and also, for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.*

*Of James Alexander Henderson and others, of the City of Kingston, Members of the Freemason's Hall Association; praying for an Act of Incorporation, under the name of "The Freemason's Hall."*

*Mr. Sidney Smith, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented to the House the Second Report of the said Committee; which was read, as followeth:--*

*Your Committee have examined the Petitions of the Municipality of the Township of Darlington, for an Act to vest a road allowance in John Farley; of W.P. McLaren and others, of the City of Hamilton, for incorporation of the Ontario Hotel Company; of the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company; and of Daniel Burritt, relative to a Road allowance, and they find all the Notices sufficient.*

*The Petition of the Bank of Montreal prays for the consolidation and amendment of the Acts relating to the said Bank, but as the amendments desired do not involve an extension of powers, the Petition is not of such a nature as to require the publication of Notice.*

(80)

*Ordered, That the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Oxford; the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Chicoutimi; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Tremblay, County of Chicoutimi; and the Petition of George Hughes and others, of the Township [of] Wellesley, County of Waterloo, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.*

*MR. BROWN moved an humble address to His Excellency, praying for copies of all papers and correspondence relative to the Penitentiary Commission.<sup>3</sup>*

*MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND suggested that as the Hon. Attorney General Macdonald was not in his place it would only be courteous if the honorable member for Lambton would postpone his motion.<sup>4</sup>*

*[It was] agreed to.<sup>5</sup>*

(80)

*Ordered, That Mr. Holton have leave to bring in a Bill to amend and consolidate the several Acts incorporating and relating to the Bank of Montreal.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Munro have leave to bring in a Bill to vest in John Farley, the younger, of the Township of Darlington, Gentleman, the allowance for road between the North halves of lots numbers eighteen and nineteen, in the fifth Concession of the Township of Darlington.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Institution of British America.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday, the eleventh day of March next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Sidney Smith have leave to bring in a Bill to vest a certain allowance for road in the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland, in John Wade and Benjamin Seymour.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,--Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Provincial Penitentiary for 1855.*

*For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 10.)*

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier also presented, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,--Report of the Senate of the University of Toronto, upon Upper Canada College for 1854.*

*For the said Report, see Appendix (No. 11.)*

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier also presented, by command of His Excellency the Governor General,--Return of Bonds and Securities recorded in the Provincial Registrar's Office, between the sixth September, 1854, and the fifteenth February, 1856, prepared in compliance with the fifteenth section, 4 and 5 Vic. cap. 91.*

*For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 12.)*

*Ordered, That the Annual Report of the Inspectors of the Provincial Penitentiary for 1855, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.*

MR. J.S. MACDONALD moved for the reading of the entries in the Journals of this House in 1849, which relate to the Address of this House to His Excellency, and the reply thereto, on the subject of convening Parliament alternately at Toronto and Quebec, with the view to the adoption of a Resolution declaring the inexpediency of further continuing that system.<sup>6</sup> He asked the Atty-Gen. for Canada East if the Governme[n]t were prepared to name a day on which the subject might be taken up.<sup>7</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said the continued indisposition of Sir Allan MacNab had prevented the Government from coming to any conclusion on this subject.<sup>8</sup> The gallant Premier and the Commissioner of Crown Lands, were still unwell.<sup>9</sup> The Government are therefore disposed to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the members of the House.<sup>10</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD, after consulting his friends<sup>11</sup>, suggested Monday week for the discussion.<sup>12</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND,--That will depend a good deal on whether there is to be a call of the House or not.<sup>13</sup>

[MR. J.S. MACDONALD] did not think a call of the House was necessary, because the members were nearly all present. If the day was fixed for Monday week members would understand that the question would come up without fail on that day. A call of the House could be given on Monday if thought necessary, and members who are not

present could be written to. He would therefore wish the question to stand for Monday week.<sup>14</sup>

MR. ALLEYN thought the time too short.<sup>15</sup> [He] suggested Wednesday week, that all the members from the Quebec district may be present.<sup>16</sup>

MR. BELLINGHAM thought that Monday week was too short a time, as some of the members were absent, and would not be present by that time.<sup>17</sup>

MR. A. MORRISON suggested that the day be fixed for this day six months.<sup>18</sup>

MR. ROBINSON thought the longer the consideration of the matter were postponed the better. The more hon. members saw of this city the better they would like it.<sup>19</sup>

MR. POWELL wished Mr. Drummond to say whether the Government were satisfied with Wednesday week. If that day were fixed, there should be a distinct understanding that there should be no postponement, for the House was full now, and though some members might have to leave soon on business, they would remain if they were sure of the question coming up definitely on Monday week.<sup>20</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said he would wish the House distinctly to understand that the Government can have no voice in the matter as a Government, either with regard to the choice of the seat of government or the making of that seat permanent.<sup>21</sup> As the question was not a Government question, and the Government could not agree about it, they would not expedite or retard the action of Parliament.<sup>22</sup> The Government therefore not having been able to agree upon the choice of the day, that choice must remain with the House. The moment this discussion came up he should consider himself as free to consider it as any member on this side of the House or on that side of the House.<sup>23</sup>

MR. POWELL thought the two statements of the Attorney General did not hang together.<sup>24</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said as a friend of a permanent seat of Government, he would advise his friends to fix a day for the discussion of this question. Could he act more frankly? He told them with the utmost frankness that he could not succeed in fixing that day, and therefore wished the House to fix a day.<sup>25</sup>

MR. LARWILL said the House was something like the Ministry. They were divided upon this question, but only the House seemed to be actuated by selfish motives. The best way, in his opinion, was to get the voice of the country upon this subject, by referring to the municipalities. (Hear, hear.)<sup>26</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS thought that Monday week was far too early a day for members from the Quebec District.<sup>27</sup> He would move in amendment that the consideration of the question be postponed till Monday fortnight.<sup>28</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) said his notice had appeared in the paper on the 18th of February and had been sent over the country, and if hon. members were so careless about the question as not to be present after that, they would not be here on Monday fortnight.<sup>29</sup> If they were to take up the question at all they might do so at an early date. If the debate were postponed for a fortnight many of the members

would by that time have returned to their homes. He therefore hoped the hon. Solicitor General would not press his amendment.<sup>30</sup>

MR. CASAULT took the same view as Solicitor General Ross.<sup>31</sup> [Il] craint que les députés absents n'aient pas le temps de se rendre à Toronto pour prendre part aux débats qui vont s'élever autour de cette question vitale. Si au contraire on fixait un jour plus éloigné, les absents pourraient arriver et les membres de la Chambre qui se trouveraient alors absents n'auraient plus aucune excuse valable à donner à leurs commettants.<sup>32</sup>

MR. LORANGER se lève et insiste au contraire pour que la prise en considération de la motion ait lieu le 10 du mois prochain. Il dit que c'est en remettant la discussion de jour en jour que cette même question a été indéfiniment renvoyée pendant la session dernière. D'ailleurs, en ce moment, presque tous les députés sont présents, tandis que dans quelque[s] jours, selon l'habitude, plusieurs d'entre eux s'éloigneront de Toronto. Il seconde, par conséquent, la proposition de l'hon. membre pour Glengary d'avoir cette question entamée le 10 mars; sinon, immédiatement plutôt que de recommencer comme par le passé cette tactique de délais qui finit par faire mourir une motion de longueur.<sup>33</sup> [He] suggested to the hon. member for Glengary that, if a greater delay than Monday week was insisted on, he should proceed immediately as he was entitled to do, his notice being first in the paper.<sup>34</sup>

MR. THIBAUDEAU se range du côté de M. Casault, ainsi que MR. EVANTUREL et MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX. Ce dernier cite entr'autres M. Taché qui n'est pas encore arrivé à Toronto<sup>35</sup>--

[A democratic member:] Il devrait être arrivé.<sup>36</sup>

MR. COM. PUB. WORKS LEMIEUX. Il a été longtemps hors de son pays, pour rendre service à la province; son absence de Toronto est bien pardonnable, et serait-il juste, lorsqu'il est sur le point d'arriver parmi nous, de discuter sans lui une question qui l'intéresse au plus haut point? Plusieurs autres membres se trouvent dans le même cas.<sup>37</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER then put hon. Mr. Macdonald's motion which he declared carried.<sup>38</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD then moved that there be a call of the house for Monday the 10th March next, in order to consider this question.<sup>39</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. D. ROSS was surprised there had been no division on this matter. It was not, he thought, fair to force the matter on members in that manner. They ought to have been allowed further time to consider it. He would therefore move in amendment, that Monday fortnight be the day fixed upon. He could not help remarking the number of hon. gentlemen who endeavored to hurry on this question. He hoped, however, the house would not act in such a hasty manner on this important question. This haste was without precedent. He did not think that in all the records of the house they would find that a call of the house had ever been made in ten days. He had heard a good deal about the present system; but behind stood another and still more important one--that of a permanent seat of Government. The latter question seemed to be studiously kept in the background. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving in amendment that Monday fortnight be fixed upon for a call of the House.<sup>40</sup>

MR. GALT would object to a fortnight's postponement. Many of the members would, no doubt, be going home at Easter, and thus the matter could not be proceeded with then.<sup>41</sup>

The amendment was carried<sup>42</sup>.

(80)

*The Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald moved, seconded by Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, and the question being proposed, That a Call of the House be made on Monday, the tenth day of March next.*

*Mr. Solicitor General Ross moved in amendment to the question, seconded by*

(81)

*Mr. Evanturel, That the word "tenth" be left out, and the word "seventeenth" inserted instead thereof,*

*And the question being put on the amendment; the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--*

YEAS.

*Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bowes, Brown, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cayley, Chapais, Christie, Crawford, Crysler, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Evanturel, Foley, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Frazer, Freeman, Gamble, Gould, Hartman, Jackson, Larwill, Lemieux, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Marchildon, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Munro, Niles, Pouliot, Price, Rhodes, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Scatcherd, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Wilson, and Wright.--(51.)*

NAYS.

*Messieurs Bell, Bourassa, Brodeur, Bureau, Church, Conger, Cooke, Cook, Charles Daoust, Jean B. Daoust, Darche, DeLong, Desaulniers, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dufresne, Felton, Ferres, Flint, Thomas Fortier, Galt, Gill, Guévremont, Holton, Jobin, Laberge, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Loranger, Lyon, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Mattice, Papin, Patrick, Poulin, Powell, Prévost, Sanborn, Sidney Smith, Somerville, Turcotte, Valois, Whitney, and Young.--(48.)*

*So it was resolved in the affirmative.*<sup>43</sup>

MR. HOLTON said he understood the question was now on the main motion, and he wished to express his extreme surprise and regret at the position the Attorney General East had chosen to assume. That hon. gentleman a little while ago, said it was impossible for the government to agree upon a day for the discussion, and said that the government as a government would do nothing either to accelerate or to retard the discussion of the question.<sup>44</sup>

MR. S. SMITH, (Northumberland) rose to a ques[tion] of order. He thought there was no use for discussion after the question had been decided.<sup>45</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman was in order.<sup>46</sup>

MR. HOLTON was surprised that the hon. member for Northumberland should rise to a point of order, without even stating what the point of order was. It was evident that he only wanted to interrupt the speaker.<sup>47</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said the hon. gentlemen had better keep to the subject.<sup>48</sup>

MR. HOLTON resumed. He said the hon. and learned Attorney General had also expressed a very strong desire to see this question disposed of in accordance with the views that hon. gentleman, and he (Mr. Holton) entertained, as well as a great majority of the people of that part of the country, from which they came.<sup>49</sup> He was greatly surprised, therefore, that the hon. gentleman after expressing his acquiescence in the policy of the hon. member for Glengary, in having an early day fixed, should afterwards with every one of his colleagues vote against it.<sup>50</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order! The question is as to the call of the House, and not of censure on any particular member.<sup>51</sup>

MR. HOLTON said he did not wish to censure any member, but understood that they were discussing the question as to the fixing of the time for the consideration of this subject. He was astonished at the hon. gentleman having so soon changed his views, and therefore wished to know what reason he could have for that change.<sup>52</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--The motion is for a call of the House for Monday fortnight. The House has declared that there shall be a call of the House for Monday fortnight.<sup>53</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD understood that the motion as amended should now be put to the House.<sup>54</sup>

MR. POWELL.--Would it be in order to move a further postponement of the question? We have seen within a few minutes how speedily a change can be effected on a member of the Government and perhaps the whole Government intend now to deal with the question harmoniously as a Government.<sup>55</sup> It was quite possible that if the subject was further discussed their (sic) might be a further change of mind in that gentleman.<sup>56</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--The House has decided that there shall be a call of the House for Monday fortnight, and no other day can now ... be fixed.<sup>57</sup>

MR. GALT apprehended that the question the House has decided was as to whether the day be fixed for Monday week or Monday fortnight, but that motion might be further amended.<sup>58</sup> We are not prevented from saying whether there shall or shall not be a call of the House at all.<sup>59</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--The amendment having been carried, no other amendment can now be made on the motion.<sup>60</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary).--But those who voted against the amendment are now at liberty to vote against the whole thing. When the Speaker puts the question--shall the main motion as amended be carried, I and others can say, no.<sup>61</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--It is not to be supposed that the House having affirmed that there shall be a call of the House on a particular day, shall next affirm that there shall be no call at all.<sup>62</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--I have a few observations to make in reply to the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Holton) from whom I so narrowly escaped annihilation a moment ago. I still tremble from the effects of it. (Laughter.)<sup>63</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--It is irregular to allow any further discussion, unless it is the sense of the House to allow the hon. gentleman to speak.<sup>64</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND (Cries of order! chair!)<sup>65</sup> asked the indulgence of the House, to answer a very serious accusation that had been made against him, by the hon. member for Montreal. He almost stood in the same position as his hon. colleague. He had been accused of having changed his views in the space of a few minutes (hear, hear). He would put it to the House whether he should have an opportunity here of making an explanation.<sup>66</sup>

MR. A. DORION, (Montreal).--If the Attorney General is allowed to speak, hon. gentlemen on this side will have a right to reply.<sup>67</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said there was no question before the House.<sup>68</sup> If the hon. gentleman wishes to be heard he has friends enough in the House who can move to that effect.<sup>69</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--I think it a matter of some importance to myself at least, if not to those who usually act with me on the Seat of Government question, that I should have an opportunity of explaining myself and convincing my hon. friend from Montreal that I have not betrayed the cause. It is the misfortune of my hon. friend that he has too great a development of the organ of marvellousness. (Laughter.) He seems to have been sent here for the purpose of always expressing concentrated astonishment. My hon. friend with that voice which always reminds me of the lamentations of Jeremiah, attacks me as if I had committed some monstrous injustice. And just the other night we heard that hon. gentleman rising and accusing hon. members on this side of displaying fidelity to the Government of the day.<sup>70</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER (rising).--Order!<sup>71</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND continuing to speak, although the Speaker had stood up,<sup>72</sup>--

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said, very warmly--I should be sorry to call the hon. member by name and submit him to the censure of the House. But he is altogether out of order, in introducing into this discussion, the debates on an entirely different question.<sup>73</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND was simply expressing his astonishment (hear, hear, chair, chair). He was simply expressing his astonishment at the indignation of the hon. member for Montreal. He meant simply to say this, that he was anxious when this question which he considered one of great importance, came before the House for discussion,<sup>74</sup> even when he was sure of victory,<sup>75</sup> even when triumph lay under his hand, he wished to secure that triumph without enabling any man to say that he (Mr. Drummond) had done him wrong or injustice, and without giving him an opportunity of making this a cause of complaint. He was not like those who when they seize power abuse it. He would wish his friends who are in favor of a permanent seat of government to make use of their majority to secure the object they have in view; but

for no other purpose. He did not wish to leave any man with a feeling rankling in his mind that he had not an opportunity of representing his constituents on this important question.<sup>76</sup> He had not taken all those who acted with him in this matter by surprise by his vote. He had crossed the House before the vote was taken and urged the hon. and learned member for Glengary who had charge of the motion to accept the amendment. He believe[d] the interest he advocated would not be damaged by another week's delay.<sup>77</sup> Several gentlemen who are in favor of a permanent seat of government are anxious for a few days to consider the question.<sup>78</sup> The hon. member for Quebec for instance (Mr. Chabot) had left last night on business connected with the Seigniorial Commission--he had shook hands with him at parting<sup>79</sup> and assured him that he would not engage in that discussion until he would have time to return.<sup>80</sup> He [Mr. Chabot] took a deep interest in this question on a different side from that he (The Attorney General) and the member for Montreal took and he might have complained of unfairness if it had been brought on before he should be enabled to return.<sup>81</sup> Had he [Mr. Drummond] at once consented to go on with this discussion, would not his friend have a right to say, "you have betrayed me, Sir; you said you were determined to postpone this question, but now you have gone on with it in my absence and before I could have time to return from Quebec." Would he not have a right to say that he was betrayed. But neither the desire to please the hon. member for Montreal, nor all the alarm that his lamentations and denunciations had caused in his bosom ... would allow him to betray his friend or betray his principles.<sup>82</sup>

The subject was then allowed to drop.<sup>83</sup>

(81)

*Then the main question, so amended, being put;*

*Ordered, That a Call of the House be made on Monday, the seventeenth day of March next.*

MR. S. SMITH (Northumberland) moved a resolution limiting the time for members to speak, to any motion, to half an hour.<sup>84</sup>

MR. BROWN urged that if such a motion was carried it would have the reverse effect of that contemplated by the hon. gentleman who had introduced it.<sup>85</sup> He believed that the rule would only tend to draw out their proceedings to greater length. No one talked longer than half-an-hour unless the House was willing to listen to him. If the rule were adopted,<sup>86</sup> it would interfere with the business of the House, for whenever any great question that required to be discussed at length came up, it would be found necessary so (sic) move that this rule be suspended.<sup>87</sup> In Congress, the rule was a nullity. It was not the long speeches which so long protracted the debates as the great number of short ones, containing nothing but repetitions of what had been said before.<sup>88</sup>

MR. ROBINSON said he should have agreed with all the member for Lambton said, but for his attack upon him and the other short speech-makers.<sup>89</sup> [Mr. Brown's] speeches were generally so lengthy, and quite the reverse of what characterized his (Mr. Robinson's) speeches, which he always endeavored should be prominent for their brevity.<sup>90</sup> He had seen the rule tried, and never knew it to do any good.<sup>91</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND hoped it would be adopted. They had a rule last Session limiting speeches to three-quarters of an hour, and he thought it did good. It would learn members condense their ideas and save time.<sup>92</sup>

MR. CAMERON thought the rule a good one, but the time too short; an hour was often required in important debates.<sup>93</sup> It was only such speeches as occupied four and five hours in the delivery that were considered tiresome, both to hear and to read.<sup>94</sup>

MR. POWELL thought he did not belong to the long winded class, yet he agreed with the views of the representative of that class. He thought it should be left to the good sense of the House. The hon. member ... thought the distinction he [Mr. Brown] drew upon the makers of long and short speeches was hardly modest coming from him.<sup>95</sup> Most of the long speeches which had been made upon the address were mere scraps gathered up from newspapers.<sup>96</sup>

MR. WILSON would support the motion. He had never heard a speech in that House which might not have been advantageously condensed within the limits of half an hour.<sup>97</sup>

MR. GAMBLE objected to the motion, as he was of opinion that members who were disposed to make long speeches would do so by some means or other, and if no other means could be adopted, they would move and be sustained in a suspension of such Rule after it had been passed. As to the observation of the member for London, he would remind him that it was not every one who was so clever as he was, so as to confine a good speech to the compass of half an hour.<sup>98</sup> He thought some hon. members were too much afraid of long speeches, and of lengthening out the session.<sup>99</sup> The practice of Parliament in England was much better than ours in Canada. There the Legislature assembled in February and continued in session till August, and being so long in session, they had the advantage of giving their tone to the Administration<sup>100</sup>. Here, as there were so long intervals between the sessions<sup>101</sup> [and] as our sessions were generally so short<sup>102</sup>, it was just the reverse--and the Administration too much gave tone to, and influenced the Legislature. (Hear, hear.)<sup>103</sup> He (Mr. Gamble) was of opinion that we should get over March better if the House was only to meet three days in the week, and confine their sittings to the day time instead of night.<sup>104</sup>

MR. J. SMITH, of Victoria, would not vote for the motion, if he thought it likely to hurry business too fast, but he believed there was little danger of that. Last session the rule had worked well, and the member for Haldimand had been frequently put down, when inclined to ramble too far, by its appreciation.<sup>105</sup>

MR. S. SMITH did not agree with the remarks which had fallen from Mr. Gamble as to the shortness of our sessions, one of which lasted on a recent occasion for six months.<sup>106</sup> The suggestion to sit only three days in the week and prolong the session came with a bad grace from the member for York, Mr. Gamble, who lived in Toronto. His (Mr. Smith's) object was to expedite the business, he believed it for the interest of the country to do this. He did not want to sit there and hear the member[s] for Haldimand and Lambton make their interminable speeches, and extracts from the newspapers read by the quire.<sup>107</sup>

MR. FOLEY thought it not fair to complain so much of the hon. member for Lambton in this regard, or of the opposition. The hon. Provincial Secretary had made the longest speech this session, and the Post Master General another. They were 33 on that Opposition to 72 on the other, and as all the latter attacked the member for Lambton he might be excused for talking a great deal.<sup>108</sup>

MR. POWELL differed with those hon. gentlemen who had asserted that the speeches of the hon. member for Lambton had occupied too much of the time of the House. He was of opinion that both members on his and the other side of the House had occupied as much time as the hon. member for Lambton.<sup>109</sup>

The motion was agreed to, without a vote.<sup>110</sup>

(81)

*On motion of Mr. Sidney Smith, seconded by Mr. Patrick,  
Resolved, That during the remainder of the Session, no Member shall have the right to speak longer than one half hour on the same question.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Freeman have leave to bring the Bill to incorporate "The Ontario Hotel Company."*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.*

MR. BROWN seeing the Hon. Attorney General, West, in his place,<sup>111</sup> begged to move "That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying him to cause to be laid before this House, copies of all applications or recommendations made to government at any time by Mr. George Brown, a member of this House, as an individual, or as Secretary to the commission appointed in 1848 to enquire into the management of the Provincial Penitentiary, or by the members of the said commission or any of them, for the pardon of any prisoner or prisoners at the time confined in the Penitentiary." In connection with this motion, the hon. member said--the same night the committee was appointed to enquire into the charges made against me by the Attorney General West, I immediately went to the hon. member for London, (Mr. Wilson,) and requested him to have the committee called for next morning. Unfortunately this could not be done, on account of the absence of the clerk of the committees; but yesterday I took similar steps, and a meeting of the committee was called for this morning. Being desirous of having the matter brought to an issue at once, I took care to go round to all the members of the Committee who were in the house last night, and requested them to be present, that we might get organised this morning. We met this morning at ten, when there were three members of the Committee present. Afterwards a fourth came in, making a quorum, but he refused to act unless the whole seven or at least six members of the Committee were present. We urged that gentleman, the hon. member for Wolfe (Mr. Felton) very much to proceed, but he would not do so. We waited on for an hour and a half, and then, as no other came, we despatched a messenger to the residences of the other three members, to beg them to come. The member for Prince Edward (Mr. Stevenson) sent word that he would be along immediately, and we waited for him a very long time, but he did not come. At half-past 12, the member for Mississquoi (Mr. Ferres) arrived. We had then five members of the committee, but that hon. gentleman positively refused to proceed, until the whole seven were present, and the result was that we broke up after sitting for three hours, trying in vain to organize the Committee. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to the sense of justice of this house whether it is fair that those charges having been sent abroad against me to the country, I should thus be prevented from getting the Committee organized. I appeal to this house, whether it is not incumbent on every member of that Com[m]ittee to give his attention closely to it, or if he is unable to do so, to resign and let some one else be appointed in his place. (Hear, hear.) The Committee has been again called for to-morrow morning, and I do appeal to those gentlemen, in the presence of the house, to give their attendance

and allow it to be organized and set to work. (Hear, hear.) I desire also, that the Attorney General should be there, and be prepared to proceed. Surely this is not a matter that should be delayed for a single hour. I am quite convinced the whole thing can be got through in a very short space of time. There can be no necessity whatever for delay, and I do hope there will be none; but that the Committee will be prepared immediately to go on with the evidence. Far (sic) my part I am ready to call witnesses to-morrow.<sup>112</sup>

MR. STEVENSON stated that he lived in a distant part of the city, which rendered it inconvenient for him to attend, but had he thought it was of any importance, he would have attended. He was not aware, however, that Mr. Sanborn had arrived, and did not think it of any importance whether they organized that day or not.<sup>113</sup>

MR. FERRES, as another member of the Committee, confessed that he felt a little aggrieved at being brought before the House so unceremoniously and sharply by the hon. member for Lambton. It was not yet 48 hours since the Committee was appointed, and not knowing that Mr. Sanborn was in town, he did not think it a matter of any importance that they should assemble to-day. Under the belief that Mr. Sanborn was still absent, he felt a reluctance about organizing the Committee till he should arrive--especially as the Committee was one of some importance. It was justly considered to be of importance by the member for Lambton, and therefore he ought not to be in so pressing a hurry for it, but should allow the proceedings to go on deliberately. The Committee, he thought, should do nothing without the presence of all the members--at any rate at the first meeting.<sup>114</sup>

MR. FELTON was somewhat surprised at the observations of the hon. member for Lambton, and the House would also be surprised, when he mentioned the following circumstances;--Immediately on its being struck he applied to the oldest members of the committee, and suggested that they should take some steps for organization. That gentleman consented, but with the caution characteristic of him, said it would be inexpedient for them to do anything till the member for Compton (Mr. Sanborn) should arrive. Having consulted, however, with the member for London (Mr. Wilson) he told him (Mr. F.), in the course of the afternoon, that the committee would probably meet this morning. He accordingly received notice last night, and at ten o'clock this morning was in the committee room, as the member for Lambton knew, and yet he named him as the first member of the committee guilty of procrastination.<sup>115</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Not at all. That is a mistake.<sup>116</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I beg the hon. member will not interrupt me. I remained for a quarter of an hour, and as no other member came I went away, leaving word with Mr. Patrick that I would be found at my desk or in the reading-room. After an hour, I believe the hon. member for Lambton himself came for me, and I accompanied him to the committee room, where I found only two other members. Afterwards I found another member of the committee in the reading-room, and he said he was willing to go in, but he would not organize with only four of us.<sup>117</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Who was that?<sup>118</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I decline to name him. I remained in this building till one o'clock. If six had come I would have been prepared to go on, but I did not like to organize with only four. I do not think, under these circumstances that the hon. member for Lambton was justified in making the observations he did. I do not desire

to procrastinate, but neither do I desire to proceed without the greatest caution, as I know everything we do or say in the matter will be seen and will be narrowly examined by the country.<sup>119</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman has entirely misunderstood me if he thought I blamed him for not being there at the hour. I know he was in the house at 10 o'clock, and ready to come to the committee room when the members all arrived. What I complained of was, that when the hon. gentleman came, he would not proceed to organize, although there was a quorum of four, and afterwards five.<sup>120</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I was not there with five.<sup>121</sup>

MR. BROWN.--The hon. gentleman forgets that Mr. Ferres came in, which made five.<sup>122</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--This discussion is quite irregular. If it is reported that the member of any committee has not attended, that member having given his excuse, the House will order him to attend next day. If he refuses again, and his non-attendance is reported to the House, it will be for the House to deal with him by placing him in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms.<sup>123</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I only wish, Mr. Speaker, to disabuse the mind of the hon. member for Wolfe of the impression that I charged him with not being present at the hour.<sup>124</sup>

DR. MASSON then stated that he had attended the Committee, but did not like to take the responsibility of organizing when there were only three or four members present. He wished at the same time to state that to-morrow being Saturday, he thought he should (sic) have a holiday as well as other members, and besides he had other Committees to attend.<sup>125</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order! The hon. member may give his reason for not attending the Committee to-day, but he should not go into a general discussion as to whether he should attend on Saturday.<sup>126</sup>

DR. MASSON.--I thought it as well to say why I should not be there to-morrow.<sup>127</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said he had heard last night incidentally that the Committee was to meet to-day for organization, and his reason for not attending was that he thought they would do nothing except to organize. As soon as this was done, he was ready to proceed. In reference to the motion, he would say that the Committee having got the whole matter in charge, he thought it should be kept as much as possible out of the House, and any papers required might be got through the Committee.<sup>128</sup> Such would be the proper course to take, and not to run before the House, because a quorum could not be met with the first day the Committee had to sit.<sup>129</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER was about to put Mr. Brown's motion when<sup>130</sup>--

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD suggested the propriety of his withdrawing it.<sup>131</sup>

MR. A. DORION, of Montreal, said the motion of the hon. member for Lambton was perfectly in order; and he could see no reason why it should not pass, as the papers

required would have to be procured either by the House or the Committee, and the present motion would facilitate their production.<sup>132</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--I did not say it was out of order, but only that it was unnecessary.<sup>133</sup>

MR. A. DORION continued to say that he thought it due to the hon. member for Lambton that the Committee should be organized without delay. (Hear, hear.) If the hon. members of that Committee were in the position of the hon. member for Lambton, he was sure they would be very anxious that not a day should be lost. If the hon. member for Soulanges (Dr. Masson) would only place himself in the position of the member for Lambton, he must see that a desire to have Saturday as a holiday should not be allowed at all to weigh with him.<sup>134</sup>

The motion was then agreed to.<sup>135</sup>

(81)

*On motion of Mr. Brown, seconded by the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of all applications or recommendations made to Government at any time by Mr. George Brown, a Member of this House, as an individual, or by him as Secretary to the Commission appointed in 1848, to inquire into the management of the Provincial*

(82)

*Penitentiary, or by the members of the said Commission or any of them, for the pardon of any prisoner or prisoners at the time confined in the Penitentiary.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Felton have leave to bring in a Bill to facilitate the arrangement of the Estates of Bankrupts in Lower Canada.*<sup>136</sup>

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Felton have leave to bring in a Bill further to amend the Criminal Law.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Thomas Fortier have leave to bring in a Bill to enforce the registration of titles to lands in the Townships of Lower Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday, the fifth day of March next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Huot have leave to bring in a Bill to establish the vote by Ballot and universal suffrage in the election of Members of the Legislative Assembly in the Province of Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

*On motion of the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald, seconded by Mr. Hartman,*<sup>137</sup>

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause the proper Officer to lay before this House, a Return of, Firstly, The total number of acres of Clergy Reserves which have been sold, giving the yearly sales and average price per acre. Secondly, The gross amount which such sales have produced. Thirdly, The expenses charged for selling, shewing the per centage on each year's receipt. Fourthly, The nett (sic) amount received, and how invested. Fifthly, The amount of commutation money paid respectively to the parties and bodies referred to in the third clause of the 18 Vic. cap. 2, designating the mode of payment, the description of security, and the amount in money. Sixthly, Also, the number of acres unsold, stating the Townships in which they are situated, and the average price per acre at which they are sold. Seventhly, The amount due on sales made prior to the passage of the above recited Act. Eighthly, The amount now on hand, what proportion invested, in what description of securities, and in cash. Ninthly, The amount of capital retained to pay the stipends under the provisions of the fourth clause of the said Act, what proportion thereof is in debentures and other securities, or in cash. Tenthly, The amount of the available balance on hand, and how invested, that this House may be in possession of the amount of capital remaining out of this fund to be divided among the different Municipalities, under the provisions of the fifth clause of the said Act, in order that the said capital may be applied in aid of the Common School Fund set apart under the 12 Vic. cap. 200, if the Legislature consider this application more conducive to the public interest.*

(83)

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Holton have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act relating to Savings Banks.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday, the tenth day of March next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Felton have leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the suppression of Intemperance.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*<sup>138</sup>

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Cartier,*

*The House adjourned until Monday next.*<sup>139</sup>

APPENDIX: 29 FEBRUARY 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: CITY OF MONTREAL INCORPORATION ACTS.]

MR. A. DORION has given notice ... [that he will move for leave to introduce] a bill to amend the acts incorporating the City of Montreal<sup>140</sup>.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: PRINTING.]

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND moved that all motions for printing be, as a matter of course, referred by the Speaker to the Printing Committee, whose duty it shall be to determine upon the expediency of printing the same in whole or in part, and the number of copies, and the cost of printing the same.<sup>141</sup>

After some remarks by some ... members, the motion was allowed to stand as a notice of motion for Monday.<sup>142</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: ANNUAL GRANT FOR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.]

MR. DUFRESNE enquired of the Ministry whether it was their intention to increase the annual grant for the support of Elementary Schools in this Province?<sup>143</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--The matter is under the consideration of the Government.<sup>144</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: CLAIMS OF MILITIAMEN IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. LABERGE enquired of Ministers, whether it was their intention to bring forward any measure for the relief of the Militiamen in Lower Canada who did not put in their claims within the time limited by the law providing for the payment of such claims.<sup>145</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND replied, they did not.<sup>146</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: CHANGES IN THE TARIFF.]

MR. HOLTON made inquiry of Ministers, whether they intend proposing any changes in the Tariff during the present Session?<sup>147</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY replied, that the government had no intention of making any material change in the Tariff this session<sup>148</sup>, but possibly one or two matters of alteration would be brought before the House during the session.<sup>149</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: PAYMENT OF GRAND JURORS IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. BOURASSA enquired of ministers whether it is their intention during the present session to make provision for the payment of Grand Jurors in Lower Canada.<sup>150</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said they had no such intention.<sup>151</sup>

[DEBATES OF THE PENITENTIARY COMMITTEE, FIRST MEETING.]

The first meeting of the Committee appointed for the purpose of enabling Hon. John A. MacDonald, Attorney General of Upper Canada, to substantiate the charges

brought against Mr. George Brown, M.P.P., in the debate on Tuesday evening, was called for ... [today] at ten o'clock.<sup>152</sup>

At half-past ten, the members present were Messrs. Wilson, Sanborn, and Masson.... Mr. Brown was also in attendance.<sup>153</sup>

MR. FELTON also entered and stated, that he would not consent to organize, unless the whole of the Committee were present, or a great majority, or some reason assigned why those not in attendance were absent. The hon. gentleman was then going away, when<sup>154</sup>--

MR. BROWN asked him to wait one moment.<sup>155</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I am desirous they should be all here, and will not take the responsibility of proceeding, unless they are. If there was only one absent, I would not stand upon that. I was here myself at ten o'clock to a minute.<sup>156</sup>

MR. WILSON.--There are four here now.--There is nothing to prevent our proceeding.<sup>157</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I shall not remain.<sup>158</sup>

MR. BROWN.--You must see that it is a matter to me of the very greatest importance, that the Committee should be organized immediately.--It is due to me, that those serious charges should be disposed of without one moment's delay.<sup>159</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I am not responsible. I was here to a moment to perform my duty.<sup>160</sup>

MR. WILSON.--But you will not remain to do it now.<sup>161</sup>

DR. MASSON.--Though we organized to-day, we could not proceed to business.<sup>162</sup>

MR. WILSON.--If we organized, we could proceed to summon witnesses.<sup>163</sup>

MR. BROWN.--It is very clear, that if you do not organize now, when you have a quorum, you are just losing so much time.<sup>164</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I stated to Mr. Patrick, that I thought the right course was to fix a day when we should proceed, and allow proper time.<sup>165</sup>

MR. WILSON.--Let us organize now so as to be in a position to issue summonses for a given day.<sup>166</sup>

MR. FELTON.--That is business, and I am not disposed to proceed.<sup>167</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I went round the House yesterday and saw the various members of the Committee, to induce them to be here. Mr. Ferres promised to come to a moment, and so did Dr. Clarke. I did not see Mr. Stevenson.<sup>168</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I did all I could to hasten the matter. I spoke to Mr. Stevenson, and I believe he spoke to Mr. Wilson, and it was in consequence of those conversations that the meeting was called for this morning. I was here to a minute and do

not think I am to blame. But I shall not take the responsibility of proceeding with a bare quorum.<sup>169</sup>

DR. MASSON.--It would be better if they were all here.<sup>170</sup>

MR. BROWN.--What difference would it make?<sup>171</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I will not take the responsibility of proceeding unless they are all here. I do not know if they have all got notices.<sup>172</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I spoke to Mr. Ferres and asked him to go to the Attorney General and tell him that I wished particularly to proceed this morning, and he went over and talked for a long time with the Attorney General. Mr. Macdonald therefore knew perfectly well that the Committee were to meet this morning, and I asked Mr. Ferres also to speak to the Solicitor General.<sup>173</sup>

MR. FELTON.--For my part I have not spoken to the Attorney General or Solicitor General since the Committee was appointed.<sup>174</sup>

At the request of MR. BROWN, ... at a quarter from eleven a messenger was sent ... to the residences of Messrs. Clarke, Ferres, and Stevenson, to endeavour to get those gentlemen to attend.<sup>175</sup>

DR. MASSON left to attend a meeting of the Committee on Public Accounts, but promised to return if the other gentlemen arrived.<sup>176</sup>

MR. FELTON then asked--Would it not suit equally well, if we organized on Monday.<sup>177</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Certainly not. I cannot allow such accusations to hang over my head one moment longer than is absolutely necessary.<sup>178</sup>

MR. FELTON.--You surely do not want us to sit on Saturdays.<sup>179</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Certainly. How can you talk of putting it off, when all those charges are going over the country, and people may be imagining me to be guilty of such things?<sup>180</sup>

MR. FELTON.--It is very natural for you to feel strongly. But perhaps the Committee do not feel so strongly.<sup>181</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Should they not feel strongly on such a subject?<sup>182</sup>

MR. FELTON.--Perhaps the more impartial and calm they are, the better.<sup>183</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Impartial! Is it being impartial to deprive me of the opportunity--the instant opportunity--of meeting charges of such a character? If such is the commencement of the Committee's proceedings what hope is there of energetic action?<sup>184</sup>

Shortly afterwards MR. FELTON left, and said he would be found for an hour in the reading-room.<sup>185</sup>

Mr. Patrick, however, came up in a few minutes, and said that Mr. Felton meeting him, had desired him to give notices for Monday next.<sup>186</sup>

About half-past eleven, the messenger returned, and said that Mr. Stevenson would be along immediately, but that he could not find Mr. Ferres or Dr. Clarke.<sup>187</sup>

At a quarter after twelve, Mr. Stevenson not having made his appearance, the members present separated, having agreed to call another meeting for Saturday.<sup>188</sup>

Not long afterwards MR. FERRES arrived and MR. BROWN proceeded to re-assemble the other four members of the Committee who were in the House.<sup>189</sup>

MESSRS. FERRES and FELTON, however, both stated that they would not proceed, until the whole seven were present.<sup>190</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 29 FEBRUARY 1856.

1. GLOBE, 1 March 1856, reports Mr. Cayley introduced one petition from the Municipality of Elderslie, and another from the Municipality of Brant, both being for the same subject. The JOURNALS concur with this information in their report of the petitions read on the 3rd March 1856.
2. GLOBE, 28 February 1856, provides more complete information on this petition: "By Mr. Freeman, from the municipality of the township of Binbrook, praying that the 38th section of the statute 16 Vic. be so amended as to place the authority in township councils of establishing such a rate of commutation money in lieu of statute labor, as they may deem proper."
3. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
4. IBID.
5. IBID.
6. IBID.
7. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
8. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
9. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
10. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
11. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
12. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
13. IBID.
14. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
15. IBID.
16. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
18. IBID.
19. IBID.
20. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
21. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
22. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
24. IBID.
25. IBID.
26. IBID.
27. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
28. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
29. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
30. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
31. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
32. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. This newspaper adds: "Le député de Montmagny parle avec chaleur et comme un homme qui s'intéresse au plus haut point à la question dont on s'occupe".
33. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
34. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
35. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856.
36. IBID.
37. IBID.
38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
39. IBID.
40. IBID.
41. IBID.
42. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.

43. LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856. This newspaper provides the following commentary on the subject under discussion, and on the vote: "On voit que derrière cette question de la permanence du siège du gouvernement s'en cache une seconde qui touche de bien plus près aux divers respectifs représentés par les divers combattants,--celle du choix de la capitale. Québec, Montréal, Kingston, Toronto se trouvent en présence; il ne s'agit plus à présent de politique, ni de race, mais d'intérêt de clocher,--les députés se le figurent du moins,--et quand la proposition de remettre la discussion au lundi, 17 du mois de mars, est mise aux voix, MM. Bourassa et Jobin descendent de leurs hauteurs démocratiques pour voter dans le même sens que MM. Desaulniers et Guévremont. M. Loranger et les MM. Dorion se rencontrent poussant fraternellement à la même roue! mais, malgré cette coalition d'un nouveau genre, la proposition est acceptée".
44. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
45. IBID.
46. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
47. IBID.
48. IBID.
49. IBID.
50. GLOBE, 1 March 1856. In a commentary, LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, specifies: "L'amendement de M. Ross fut emporté par une majorité de trois, 51 contre 48,--messieurs Drummond, Cartier, Dostaler, Marchildon, Thibaudeau et le solliciteur-général Smith votant pour.... Que messieurs Cartier et Drummond aient voté de cette manière lorsque leurs seuls votes étaient suffisants pour faire perdre l'amendement de Mr. Ross, c'est une chose tout-à-fait singulière après le tapage qu'ils ont fait, et surtout M. Drummond, en faveur de la permanence. M. Holton a de suite signalé l'inconsistance dont ces messieurs venaient de se rendre coupables, et cela en termes forts et énergiques, ce qui a pour la première fois depuis le commencement de la session fort excité la bile du procureur-général".
51. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
52. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
53. IBID.
54. IBID.
55. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
56. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
57. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
58. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
59. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
60. IBID.
61. IBID.
62. IBID.
63. GLOBE, 1 March 1856. LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, comments on Mr. Drummond's attitude: "Il s'est laissé aller à un de ces mouvements impétueux qui, d'un bel orateur qu'il est quand il est dans son état normal, en font un comédien burlesque."
64. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
65. IBID.
66. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
67. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
68. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
69. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
70. IBID.

71. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
72. IBID.
73. IBID.
74. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
75. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
76. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
77. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
78. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
79. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
80. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
81. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
82. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856. In its commentary, LE PAYS, 8 March 1856, explains Mr. Drummond's vote in these words: "Mais depuis quand M. Drummond ou tout autre est-il obligé d'attendre pour voter sur une mesure ceux qui ont des vues contraires? C'est le moyen le plus sûr de donner gain de cause à ses adversaires.... Non, M. Drummond et M. Cartier ne sont pas assez dépourvus d'intelligence et de sens commun pour se croire ainsi liés à ne pas procéder sur la question du siège du gouvernement, parce que quatre membres qui sont opposés à leurs vues sont absents. Il y a d'autres moyens beaucoup plus naturels d'expliquer leur conduite. La coalition actuelle a été formée et M. Cauchon est entré au ministère, avec l'entente formelle entre lui et Sir Allan McNab de continuer le système alternatif et messieurs Drummond et Cartier ne veulent pas prendre les moyens de fixer le siège du gouvernement, parce qu'ils ont peur de briser la coalition et de perdre leurs places. Et ils sacrifient ainsi l'intérêt de leurs constituans et du pays entier à leur ambition personnelle."
83. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
84. IBID.
85. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
86. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
87. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
88. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
89. IBID.
90. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
91. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
92. IBID.
93. IBID.
94. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
95. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
96. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
97. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
98. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
99. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
100. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
101. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
102. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
103. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
104. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
105. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
106. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
107. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
108. IBID.

109. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
110. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
111. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856. This newspaper already reported one prior rise for motion by Mr. Brown (see footnotes 3 to 5). GLOBE, 1 March 1856, differs and reports Mr. Brown "had twice before risen to move" his resolution.
112. GLOBE, 1 March 1856. This newspaper also reports the proceedings of the first meeting of the Committee to investigate the charges against Mr. Brown, here condensed in his speech. We chose to replicate this report in the Appendix of this day, for the reader's consideration.
113. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
114. IBID.
115. IBID.
116. IBID.
117. IBID.
118. IBID.
119. IBID.
120. IBID.
121. IBID.
122. IBID.
123. IBID.
124. IBID.
125. IBID.
126. IBID.
127. IBID.
128. IBID.
129. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
130. IBID.
131. IBID.
132. IBID.
133. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
134. IBID.
135. IBID.
136. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 18 March 1856, reports the following information on this Bill: "It provides for the making of a composition by notarial deed fyled in the Prothonotary's office between the debtor and a majority of his creditors holding at least three fourths of the claims against him, making an assignment for their mutual benefit to the Prothonotary, the creditors accepting such assignment as a full discharge of their claims; or the deed may contain a composition without such assignment, the creditors agreeing to accept a stated per centage of these claims in full discharge. Such deed is to be made applicable to all the creditors signing or not signing, so as to secure equal dividend to all. The deed being fyled the Prothonotary shall advertise all creditors to come in on a certain day to shew cause why the deed is not to be homologated, and the issue of such notice will operate a stay of all legal proceedings against the debtor. If no sufficient cause is shown, deed is homologated by the Court, and becomes binding on all the creditors. An Assistant Assignee may be appointed in cases of assignment by the creditors or the Prothonotary to bind up the estate. The assets are thereafter to be distributed or collocated among the creditors. Provision is also made that a Judge of the Superior Court may upon the affidavit of creditors to the amount of 100L to each debt, and the insolvency of their debtor issue a writ to attach all the property of such person, and his estate is to become vested in the

Prothonotary by the effect of that writ to be dealt with in the same manner as under the assignment, the debtor having no more power to deal with it except by agreement with his creditors."

137. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856, reports this resolution was moved by Mr. Merritt. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856, specifies Mr. J.S. Macdonald moved the resolution "in the absence of Mr. Merritt".
138. In a commentary, MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, remarks: "The Prohibitory Liquor Law advocates have opened the campaign. Petitions daily come in by the half-dozen or dozen; a Committee has been appointed, and Mr. Felton, in order to take time by the forelock, and not lose his place among the champions of the cause, has introduced a bill."
139. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856, reports the House adjourned at "half-past five o'clock." LA MINERVE, 8 March 1856, concurs with this information.
140. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
141. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 1 March 1856.
142. IBID.
143. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
144. IBID.
145. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
146. IBID.
147. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
148. IBID.
149. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
150. IBID.
151. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 3 March 1856.
152. GLOBE, 1 March 1856. Although this debate occurred outside the House, it was inserted here as the proceedings of this Select Committee are of very great interest. In addition, the report of the debates of the second meeting was also replicated in the Appendix of the 1st March 1856.
153. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
154. IBID.
155. IBID.
156. IBID.
157. IBID.
158. IBID.
159. IBID.
160. IBID.
161. IBID.
162. IBID.
163. IBID.
164. IBID.
165. IBID.
166. IBID.
167. IBID.
168. IBID.
169. IBID.
170. IBID.
171. IBID.
172. IBID.
173. IBID.
174. IBID.
175. IBID.
176. IBID.

177. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
178. IBID.
179. IBID.
180. IBID.
181. IBID.
182. IBID.
183. IBID.
184. IBID.
185. IBID.
186. GLOBE, 1 March 1856. Mr. Patrick acts as Clerk of the Committees.
187. GLOBE, 1 March 1856.
188. IBID.
189. IBID.
190. IBID.

SATURDAY, 1 MARCH 1856.

APPENDIX.

[DEBATES OF THE PENITENTIARY COMMITTEE, SECOND MEETING.]

The Committee was again called for Saturday morning at ten o'clock. About half-past ten Mr. Wilson, Mr. Sanborn and Mr. Masson were present in the Committee Room, and Messrs. Felton, Stevenson and Clarke were in another part of the building, waiting the arrival of Mr. Ferres. A messenger was despatched for Mr. Ferres, who sent word that he would be in attendance shortly. Messrs. Felton, Stevenson, and Clarke then came to the Committee Room; and besides the members of the Committee, there were present Mr. George Brown, M.P.P., Mr. David Christie, M.P.P., and a reporter from the Globe. Attorney General Macdonald came in shortly afterwards.<sup>1</sup>

MR. FELTON, immediately on the gentlemen taking their seats, said he desired that no strangers should be present.<sup>2</sup>

MR. BROWN having enquired of the Clerk, what was the rule on the subject,<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Patrick stated that every Committee could clear the room, if they pleased.<sup>4</sup>

MR. CHRISTIE and MR. BROWN then took their hats and were about to retire, when<sup>5</sup>--

Mr. Patrick added that every Committee was open until there was a special motion carried to the contrary.<sup>6</sup>

DR. CLARKE said that no one objected to members of Parliament being present.<sup>7</sup>

MR. BROWN.--There can only be two sorts of committees, a close committee and an open one. If this Committee is to sit with closed doors, members of Parliament cannot remain.<sup>8</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I did not allude to members of Parliament, but I will state plainly what I mean; that I do not like the proceedings of the Committee to be reported by reporters on one side.<sup>9</sup>

MR. BROWN.--I do not think it is competent for the Committee to shut out reporters.<sup>10</sup>

MR. WILSON.--Let us first organize the Committee, and we may then talk that other matter over.<sup>11</sup>

Mr. Patrick accordingly read the resolution of the House appointing the Committee.<sup>12</sup>

MR. FELTON then moved that James Moir Ferres, Esq., be Chairman of the Committee.<sup>13</sup>

MR. STEVENSON seconded the motion.<sup>14</sup>

MR. SANBORN moved that John Wilson, Esq., be the Chairman.<sup>15</sup>

DR. MASSON here read an extract from a volume on Parliamentary proceedings, to the effect that strangers might be present at meetings of committees, but should retire when the Committee thought fit.<sup>16</sup>

MR. SANBORN then proceeded to recommend Mr. Wilson as Chairman, on account of his long experience. His being a lawyer also would greatly assist the Committee.<sup>17</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--I do not see the necessity of the Chairman being a lawyer.<sup>18</sup>

MR. SANBORN.--Lawyers, from their profession, are more accustomed to investigate matters of this kind than non-professional men.<sup>19</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--Mr. Wilson would on that account be of more service as a member of the Committee than as chairman.<sup>20</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Can the committee go to work without the chairman being present? Mr. Ferres says he will be engaged a good deal on the Argenteuil Committee.<sup>21</sup>

MR. SANBORN.--I had forgot that. He said yesterday that he did not know whether he could attend or not--that he was on an election committee, which is of a very exacting nature, and that if this committee conflicts with the other, he would be away from this one.<sup>22</sup>

DR. CLARKE.--They do not need to conflict. The time for election committees meeting is fixed by the house, but we can fix our meetings ourselves.<sup>23</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--The Argenteuil committee will not probably sit above one or two days.<sup>24</sup>

MR. BROWN.--If four or five members come together, and the chairman is not present, can they appoint a chairman pro tem?<sup>25</sup>

Mr. Patrick stated that that might be done, after the committee was once in operation, but it could not be organized, unless the chairman was present.<sup>26</sup>

MR. FERRES having arrived at this point, was elected chairman on Mr. Felton's motion, without a division.<sup>27</sup>

Mr. Patrick said he had received several applications for the situation of clerk of this committee.<sup>28</sup>

DR. CLARKE.--I think we should in the first instance arrive at some decision on the question raised by Mr. Felton, whether we are to allow a Reporter to be here, or to let any of the proceedings of the committee be sent to the public.<sup>29</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I think it would be highly inexpedient that the proceedings of this committee should be reported, until they are concluded.<sup>30</sup>

MR. FERRES.--You had better make a regular motion.<sup>31</sup>

MR. WILSON.--This is a committee, the proceedings of which will be watched with great interest, and for that reason, I think they ought to be published.<sup>32</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--It is a breach of privilege to publish any proceedings that take place before a committee, until they have made their report to the house.<sup>33</sup>

MR. FERRES.--That would depend altogether on the course resolved on by the committee.<sup>34</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--I should not object, however, myself to having reporters admitted.<sup>35</sup>

MR. FELTON.--That is, with the understanding that the proceedings are not to be published?<sup>36</sup>

MR. STEVENSON.--Of course.<sup>37</sup>

MR. FELTON.--I have no objection either to the proceedings being carefully taken down. But I think that those only should be taken down that are to be placed on record.<sup>38</sup>

DR. MASSON.--I would think it very improper to publish the proceedings as we go on.<sup>39</sup>

DR. CLARKE.--Or the conversations that occur in this Committee Room.<sup>40</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. MACDONALD.--All the evidence will be reported to the House, and become the property of the House. I understand that the rule of Parliament is that the proceedings of a Committee cannot be published till they are reported to the House, and then the House takes action upon them.<sup>41</sup>

MR. FERRES.--Still you will see the proceedings of Committees of the House of Commons published long before they are reported.<sup>42</sup>

Mr. Patrick.--But only by connivance.<sup>43</sup>

MR. WILSON.--The proceedings of the House are only published by connivance.<sup>44</sup>

MR. FELTON.--If the Committee had a newspaper of their own, in which they could put themselves right in the eyes of the public, and correct misrepresentations, it would be different. But I desire nothing shall be misrepresented. To say that the reports shall not be published at all, is all moonshine, because none of us will take the trouble to hunt any publisher or reporter for having broken the rule, but our better course is to say that no report shall be published until the whole matter is disposed of. I do not think we can be called upon to be looking into newspapers all the time, to see whether they are misrepresenting us or not.<sup>45</sup>

DR. CLARKE.--The proceedings ought to be published after they are regularly authenticated, but I object to any report being given of anything said by any member of the Committee here.<sup>46</sup>

MR. FERRES.--In considering what action we are to take on this matter, I think it better that we should be by ourselves.<sup>47</sup>

All present then withdrew, except the seven members of the Committee, and Mr. Patrick.<sup>48</sup>

About twelve o'clock, Mr. Patrick came out and asked Mr. Brown for a copy of Mr. Smith's (the late Warden of the Penitentiary's) petition to Parliament in 1850--a member having stated that he had seen a copy in his possession. Mr. Patrick stated that the copy belonging to the House had been burned with the Parliament Buildings, and that the only remains of it was the record on the journal.<sup>49</sup>

MR. BROWN replied that he would not lay it before the Committee; it was not what Mr. Smith had averred, but what Mr. Attorney General Macdonald had averred, that was the subject of investigation. He had no objection, however, to show the document to any member of the Committee who might desire to see it.<sup>50</sup>

In a quarter of an hour more, the doors were opened, and the Committee-room was entered by reporters from the Globe, Colonist, and Leader, as well as by MR. AT. GEN. MACDONALD and MR. BROWN.<sup>51</sup>

MR. FERRES then stated that the Committee had come to the conclusion that the proceedings should not be published in the meantime--and that they would now adjourn till Monday, to proceed then to the consideration of some preliminary matters.<sup>52</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Cannot we go on and examine witnesses to-day? Will the settlement of those points make any difference as to that?<sup>53</sup>

MR. FERRES.--There are some preliminary matters we wish to talk over, and we can do nothing till these are disposed of.<sup>54</sup>

MR. BROWN.--Cannot summonses be issued now for witnesses?<sup>55</sup>

MR. FERRES.--Not till these preliminaries are disposed of.<sup>56</sup>

The Committee then adjourned till Monday morning.<sup>57</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 1 MARCH 1856.

1. GLOBE, 3 March 1856. This Appendix covers part of the debates of the second meeting of the Penitentiary Committee, as reported by this newspaper.
2. GLOBE, 3 March 1856.
3. IBID.
4. IBID.
5. IBID.
6. IBID.
7. IBID.
8. IBID.
9. IBID.
10. IBID.
11. IBID.
12. IBID.
13. IBID.
14. IBID.
15. IBID.
16. IBID.
17. IBID.
18. IBID.
19. IBID.
20. IBID.
21. IBID.
22. IBID.
23. IBID.
24. IBID.
25. IBID.
26. IBID.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. IBID.
30. IBID.
31. IBID.
32. IBID.
33. IBID.
34. IBID.
35. IBID.
36. IBID.
37. IBID.
38. IBID.
39. IBID.
40. IBID.
41. IBID.
42. IBID.
43. IBID.
44. IBID.
45. IBID.
46. IBID.
47. IBID.
48. IBID.
49. IBID.
50. IBID.

51. GLOBE, 3 March 1856.
52. IBID.
53. IBID.
54. IBID.
55. IBID.
56. IBID.
57. GLOBE, 3 March 1856. A commentary from MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, reports:  
"A member of the Committee remarked to-day that it would be well in future sessions to appoint a Standing Committee to be called the Scandal Committee to whom all these matters might be referred."

MONDAY, 3 MARCH 1856.

(83)

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House,--Statement of the Affairs of the Quebec Provident and Savings Bank, on the 1st March, 1855.

For the said Statement, see Appendix, (No. 5.)

And also, Accounts and Statements of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, on 31st December, 1855.

For the said Accounts and Statements, see Appendix, (No. 13.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Thibaudeau,--The Petition of Antoine Charles Taschereau.

By Mr. Poulin,--The Petition of the Very Reverend E. Cr  vier, Founder of the Academy for Girls of the Parish of Rouville.

By Mr. Larwill,--The Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Kent; and the Petition of Thomas Jackson and others, of the South-Western portion of the County of Kent.

By Mr. Church,--The Petition of H. McCrea and others, of the Township of Wolford, County of Grenville; and the Petition of Hiram McCrea and others, of the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville.

By Mr. Ferrie,--The Petition of David Ballingal and others, of the Township of South Dumfries, County of Brant.

By the Honorable Mr. Young,--The Petition of the Medical Faculty of McGill College.

By Mr. Solicitor General Smith,--The Petition of John Young and others, Merchants, Tradesmen, and others, of the City of Hamilton.

By Mr. Papin,--The Petition of L.G. Nolin and others, of the Parish of L'Assomption; and the Petition of C. Courteau and others, of the County of L'Assomption.

By Mr. Dufresne,--The Petition of Ludger LeBlanc and others, of the Parish of St. Lignori, County of Montcalm.

(84)

By Mr. Niles,--The Petition of James Beattie and others, of the Township of Westminster, County of Middlesex.

By Mr. Roblin,--The Petition of D.B. Stickney and others, of the Township of Camden East; and the Petition of Job Aylesworth and others, of the Township of Camden, County of Addington.

By Mr. Somerville,--The Petition of Sarah Odell, of the Village of Huntingdon, Widow of the late William Bowron; and the Petition of Donald Livingston, of the Parish of St. Anicet.

By Mr. Sidney Smith,--The Petition of Caleb Mallery and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; the Petition of John Beatty and others, of the Town of Cobourg; the Petition of Mrs. Mary Woods and others, of the Town of Cobourg; the Petition of William Hargraft and others, of the Town of Cobourg; the Petition of Mrs. George Stevens and others, of the Town of Cobourg; The Petition of John Field and others, of the Town of Cobourg; The Petition of R.C. Wilkins and others, of the Township of Murray, County of Northumberland; and the Petition of John Holman and others, of the Town of Cobourg.

By Mr. Antoine Aim   Dorion,--The Petition of John Collins and others, members of the Committee of the Montreal Eye and Ear Institution.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of Andrew Nicol and others, of the Town of Clinton, County of Huron; the Petition of George R. Bruner and others, of the Township of Gosfield, County of Essex; the Petition of William Symington and others, of the Township of Colborne, County of Huron; and the Petition of Solomon Jones and others, of the Township of Pembroke, County of Renfrew.

By Mr. Bowes,--The Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City of Toronto.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of John Thompson and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

By Mr. Aikins,--The Petition of Henry Pearson and others, of the Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel; the Petition of Joseph Roadhouse and others, of the Township of Albion, County of Peel; the Petition of John Snyder and others, of the Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel; and the Petition of Alexander Campbell and others, of the Townships of Cheltenham and Chinguacousy, County of Peel.

By Mr. Hartman,--the Petition of the Reverend J. Fishburn and others, of the Township of Markham, County of York; and the Petition of Alexander Muir and others, of the Township of Scarborough, County of York.

By Mr. Bell,--The Petition of Mrs. Jannett Allan and others, of the Township of Perth and vicinity; and the Petition of William Allan and others, of the Town of Perth and vicinity.

By Mr. James Smith,--The Petition of C. Knowlson and others, of the Village of Metcalfe, County of Victoria; the Petition of William Best and others, of the Township of Ops; the Petition of Alexander Feir and others, of the Township of Ops; the Petition of Mrs. Ann McHugh and others, of the Township of Manvers; and the Petition of W.W. Darnell and others, of Ops and other Townships, County of Victoria.

By Mr. Christie,--The Petition of Mrs. Mary Lawrence and others, of the Township of Pilkington, County of Wellington; and the Petition of Robert Henderson and others, of the Township of Elora, County of Wellington.

By Mr. Freeman,--the Petition of Stephen King and others, of the Township of Barton, County of Wentworth; and the Petition of Mrs. Catherine Smith and others, of the Township of Barton, County of Wentworth.

By Mr. Powell,--The Petition of Thomas G. Anderson and others, of the Township of Nepean, County of Carleton; the Petition of George Bell and others, of the Township of Nepean, County of Carleton; two Petitions of the Municipality of the Town-

(85)

ship of Nepean; and two Petitions of the Municipality of the Township of Goulburn.

By Mr. Chapais,--Four Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Kamouraska; and the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Chicoutimi.

By the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond,--The Petition of the City Bank.

By Mr. Charles Daoust,--Two Petitions of the Reverend L.D. Charland, Curé of the Parish of St. Clément, and others, of the County of Beauharnois.

By the Honorable Mr. Cameron,--The Petition of the Commercial Bank, Midland District; and the Petition of the Society of Odd Fellows.

By Mr. Guévremont,--The Petition of the Reverend J.M. Limages and others, of the Borough of William Henry.

By Mr. Mackenzie,--Two Petitions of Alexander Kennedy and others, of the Township of Esquesing, County of Halton.

By Mr. Southwick,--The Petition of D.J. Hughes and others, of the County of Elgin.

By Mr. Felton,--The Petition of G.N. Cleveland and others, of the Township of Shipton, District of Saint Francis.

By the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald,--The Petition of James Cunningham and others, of the Township of Charlottenburgh, County of Glengarry.

By Mr. Prévost,--The Petition of Mathieu Fournier, of the Parish of Ste. Rosalie; and the Petition of P.G.H. Roy, of the Parish of St. Hyacinthe.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of Jacob Shoults and others, of the Township of McGillivray, County of Huron; and the Petition of John Atkinson and others, of the Township of Biddulph, County of Huron.

By Mr. Holton,--The Petition of the Committee of the British and Canadian School Society of Montreal.

By Mr. Alleyn,--The Petition of D. Myrand and others, Electors of the City of Quebec.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of Gédéon Poirier, President, and others, School Commissioners of the Parish of St. Esprit, County of Montcalm; praying aid for a Superior School in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend T. Caron and others, of the Parish of Ste. Monique; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of "La Compagnie du Pont de Ste. Monique."

Of Norbert Béliveau, of the Parish of St. Grégoire, County of Nicolet; representing that in December, 1849, he was appointed by the Municipal Council of the said County to assess certain property in the Parish of St. Grégoire, and that on the twenty-sixth of January following, all his outbuildings, grain, and cattle, to the amount of three hundred and seventy-five pounds, were destroyed by incendiaries in consequence of his having made the said Assessment, and praying compensation.

Of E. McCrea and others, of the Village of Merrickville; of John Chester and others, of the Township of Montague, County of Lanark; of William Kerfoot and others, of the Township of Montague, County of Lanark; of Francis Rae and others, of the Village of Stouffville, County of York; of Sylvanus W. Sharnard and others, of the Township of Pickering, County of Ontario; of Donald Campbell and others, of the Township of Drummond, County of Lanark; of the Independent Order of Good Templars of the City of Hamilton, County of Wentworth; of the Hamilton Division, number twenty-five, of the Sons of Temperance; of William Harvey and others, of the Township of Malahide, County of Elgin; of Isaac Rose and others, of the Township of Williamsburgh, County

(86)

of Dundas; of Josiah Purkiss and others, of the Village of Thornhill, County of York; of Robert Bond and others, of the Township of Caradoc, County of Middlesex; of Donald Grant and others, of the Township of Oro, County of Simcoe; of A. Raymond and others, of the Township of Orillia and vicinity, County of Simcoe; of Mrs. Mary Clarke and others, of the Township of Clarke, County of Durham; of the Sons of Temperance, number two hundred and nineteen, Lindsay Division, in the Township of Ops, County of Victoria; and of Robert Michael and others, of the East Riding of the County of Elgin; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Onondago, County of Brant; praying that power may be given to the Municipalities, Cities, and Towns, as will enable them to regulate the time of Exhibitions of Horse-riders, Mountebanks, and other Showmen, visiting this Province, and to exercise all other control over the same.

Of the Town Council of the Town of Paris; and of Lymon Chepin, Chairman of a Public Meeting, on behalf of the Rate-payers of the Township of Brantford; praying for the passing of an Act authorizing the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company to lease their Road, and also, for the passing of an Act incorporating the Lake Huron and Buffalo Railroad Company.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Bruce, County of Bruce; of the Municipality of the Township of Elderslie, County of Bruce; and of the Municipality of the

Township of Brant, County of Bruce; praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the construction of a Railroad from the waters of Lake Huron at Saugeen to the waters of Ontario at Toronto.

Of John McArthur and others, proprietors of Land in the first range of the Parish of [St.] Anicet, County of Huntingdon; praying compensation for damage done to their property caused by the Dam erected by the Board of Works at the head of the Beauharnois Canal.

Of the College of Bytown; praying for aid.

Of Thompson Smith and others, of the Counties of Halton, Peel, and York; and of Aaron Oliphant and others, of the Counties of Halton, Peel, and York; praying for the passing of a law to protect their property which extends to the waters of Lake Ontario from injury.

Of the Municipal Council of the United Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying for the passing of an Act to disunite the Counties of Lincoln and Welland, also for the passing of an Act to amend the Municipal Act of Upper Canada.

Of the Reverend J.E.D. Dupuis, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St[e]. Anne de la Pêrade, District of Three Rivers; praying aid for an Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Mount Pleasant Seminary Association; praying for an aid, and also for an Act of Incorporation.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Hastings; praying for an Act to enable Township Municipalities to re-divide their respective Townships into School Sections.

Of L'Institut Canadien d'Iberville; praying aid for the erection of a Mechanics' Institute and Library Association at St. Athanase.

Of L'Institut Canadien d'Iberville; praying for aid.

Of the Corresponding Committee at Montreal, of the Colonial Church and School Society; praying for aid.

Of Miss Eliza M. Hervey, Directress, and others, the Committee of the Home and School of Industry, of Montreal; praying for aid.

Of P. Manny; representing that his son John Manny and himself are the Inventors of a Reaping and Mowing Machine; and praying that he may be granted a Patent for the term of fourteen years.

(87)

Of Thomas Scholfield and others; and of W. Mellanby and others, all of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying for the passing of [an] Act to enable the Port Dalhousie and (sic) Thorold Railway Company, to extend their line of Railway from Thorold to Port Colborne, on Lake Erie.

Of Pierre Boisseau, of the City of Quebec; setting forth that he is proprietor of certain lots of land in the Township of Newton, which Township is divided on the Southwest side by the line which separates Upper from Lower Canada; and that he suffers great loss from the uncertainty of the correctness of the said line which divides Upper from Lower Canada; and praying that an Act may be passed establishing the said line.

Of Edwin Larwill and A. Rankin, of the Counties of Essex and Kent; praying for the passing of an Act to amend and extend the Charter of the Amherstburgh and St. Thomas Railway Company.

Of William Millar and others, of the Town of Sydenham, County of Grey; praying for an Act to incorporate the Town of Sydenham, in the said County, as the Town of Owen Sound.

Of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Montreal; praying for aid on behalf of the National School at Montreal.

Of the Sherbrooke Academy; praying for aid to rebuild the said Academy, which was destroyed by fire.

Of the Institut Littéraire of Sherbrooke; praying for aid to enlarge the said Institution.

Of the Sherbrooke Academy; praying for aid.

Of Caleb Jordan and others, of the Townships within the Eastern Circuit of the District of St. Francis; praying for certain amendments to the Act to increase the number of sittings of the Courts of Justice within the District of St. Francis.

Of P.N. Dorion and others, of the Township of Grantham; and of G.L. Marler, Mayor, and others, of the Township of Grantham, County of Drummond; praying that means may be adopted to prevent the damage done to their property by the periodical inundations of the River Noire.

Of the Reverend A.F. Truteau, Vicar General, and others; praying for aid on behalf of the Catholic School for Deaf and Dumb girls, in the Parish of Longue Pointe.

Of the Reverend J.B. Drapeau, Curé, and others, of the Parish of Longue Pointe, District of Montreal; praying aid for a Female Academy in the said Parish.

Of Cornelius Krieghoff, of the City of Quebec; praying for aid to enable him to complete a Panorama, and a series of Tableaux in oil, descriptive of Canada.

Of Leonard Wilcox, of the City of Toronto; setting forth certain grievances, and praying for relief.

Of the Protestant Board of School Commissioners of the City of Montreal; praying for aid.

Of A. Stein and others, of the Village of St. Christophe d'Arthabaska; praying that those persons who have settled in the Eastern Townships, coming under the name of Squatters, may be protected by law in the rights they have so acquired, and also, that to encourage settlement in the said Townships, free grants of a lot of land may be given to those who intend to become actual settlers.

Of A. Stein and others, of the Village of St. Christophe d'Arthabaska; praying that the annual grant of 50,000L for Common Schools, may be increased to 150,000L.

Of the Reverend P.M. Mignault, Curé, of Chambly; praying aid for the construction of a Seminary for the Education of Females in the said Parish.

Of the Corporation of the College of Chambly; praying for aid.

Of the Corporation of the College of Masson, of the Parish of Terrebonne, County of Terrebonne; praying for aid.

(88)

Of Pierre Guibord and others, of the Parish of St. Paul, County of Joliette; praying aid for the School of the said Parish.

Of the Reverend A. Manseau, Curé, and others, School Commissioners, of the Village of l'Industrie, County of Joliette; praying for aid.

Of the School Commissioners of the Municipality of St. Philomène, County of Chateauguay; praying aid for the erection of an Academy in the said Municipality.

Of the Corporation of the Montreal Asylum for aged and infirm women and orphans; praying for aid in behalf of the said Asylum.

Of the Reverend Louis Proulx, Curé, and others, of Ste. Marie de la Nouvelle Beauce; praying for aid in behalf of the Seminary established in the said Parish for the education of girls.

Of Henry A. Hardy and others, of the Town of Brantford; praying for the passing of an Act for the encouragement of Horticulture.

Of Absalom Shade and others, Merchants, Manufacturers, and others, of the Village of Galt, and surrounding country, County of Waterloo; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of the "North-western Railway Company."

Of the Municipal Council of the Parish of Ste. Foye, District of Quebec; praying that the Road leading from St. Lewis Highroad, to the Cove Beach Road, passing to

the Church of St. Richard, may be macadamized, and placed under the control of the Quebec Turnpike Trust.

Of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the City of Toronto; praying for aid.

Of the Reverend Z. Sirois and others, of the Township of Montminy, Parish of St. Pierre; praying aid to complete the Road from Rivière du Sud, to the Township of Montminy.

Of Thomas Simard and others, Branch Pilots for and below the Harbor of Quebec; praying for certain amendments to the Act 12 Vic., cap. 114, to regulate the Pilotage for and below the Port of Quebec.

Of the Reverend Féréol Dorval and others, of the Village and Parish of L'Assomption; praying for aid in support of the School under the care of the Sisters of the Congregation of the said Parish.

Of Hilaire Allard and others, of the Village of L'Avenir; praying for an Elective Legislative Council, an Elective Governor, and for the recall of Sir Edmund Head.<sup>2</sup>

Ordered, That Mr. Church have leave to bring in a Bill to vest in Daniel Burritt a certain allowance for Road in the Township of Marlborough.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday, the eleventh day of March, instant.

MR. YOUNG moved that the statement of the affairs of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, sent down to this House, be printed for the use of the members.<sup>3</sup>

(88)

Ordered, That the Accounts and Statements of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, on 31st December, 1855, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

Ordered, That Mr. Masson have leave to bring in a Bill to establish a Circuit Court in and for the County of Soulanges.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.

Ordered, That Mr. Alley have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law of Evidence in Lower Canada.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.

(89)

Ordered, That Mr. Felton have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act for increasing the Sittings of the Courts in the District of St. Francis.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.

On motion of Mr. Ferres, seconded by Mr. Loranger,

Ordered, That all the Entries in the Journals of this House of last Session, relative to the Petitions of John Maguire, of the City of Quebec, Superintendent of Police, of Samuel Snell, of Jean Dion, and of William Wright and others, be now read.

And the same being read;

Resolved, That the said Petitions and the Minutes of Evidence taken by the Select Committee of this House at last Session be referred to a Select Committee,

*composed of Mr. Ferres, Mr. Desaulniers, Mr. Loranger, Mr. Ferrie, and Mr. Rhodes, for investigation into the respective prayers of the said Petitions; to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Casault have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act 12 Vic., cap. 114.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND moved--That all motions for printing be as a matter of course referred by the Speaker to the Printing Committee, whose duty it shall be to report upon the expediency of printing the same in whole or in part, the substance or extracts, and the number of copies, with an estimate of the cost of such printing.<sup>4</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE opposed this proposition. There was no system in such an arrangement, and it led to unnecessary expense, for \$30,000 a year was paid out for useless printing, which might be of material benefit to the country in other ways. Until the Government applied the proper remedy, all these motions by the Attorney Generals East and West were useless.<sup>5</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY did not agree with the hon. member, who had just spoken.<sup>6</sup> The Government made this motion expressly (*sic*) for the purpose of saving the expense of printing useless documents, and yet Mr. Mackenzie<sup>7</sup> would wish to insinuate probably that it was a job affair.<sup>8</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE had no such an idea for a moment, but he meant to say, that a committee chosen by the hon. gentleman opposite was not a fit body to judge, whether it was fit or not to print documents, and any particular part of them.<sup>9</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said, the Committee was the proper body to act in the matter in the first instance, and the House could determine upon the presentation of their report, whether it would or not adopt it.<sup>10</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) thought there should be some remedy resorted to, to prevent excess of printing, and the printing committee would have a great deal cast upon them by this motion, and would not be able to report upon the expediency of printing documents as speedily as the nature and the importance of them demanded.<sup>11</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY wished the proposed plan to be tried. If it was not successful, some other could be introduced.<sup>12</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) said, the notice ought to be referred to the printing committee before the motion was made before the house.<sup>13</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary.)--It would be competent for hon. members upon the report being made by the committee, to move for a re-commitment, and much debate and time would be occupied.<sup>14</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal,) saw this difficulty in the way, that if a motion was made in the House, it must be disposed of either by the House granting it or not. If it be granted, then the committee could not say, "We will only print a part of what the House adopted."<sup>15</sup>--

MR. BROWN.--Hear! hear!<sup>16</sup>

MR. A. DORION (continued).--Therefore the system must be adopted, that the notice should be referred to the printing Committee to report upon it when the motion shall be made. He did not think that it was the intention of the House to give the power to the Committee to say what parts of documents they would print, but he desired that at some stage or other the documents which the hon. member wanted printed, should be referred to the Committee with the report, and that there should be a motion to print it, but to give the committee power to curtail or not was not desirable.<sup>17</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said it was proposed that the motion should be referred at once, before the House had taken any action upon it. He did not see any difficulty in taking that course. It would be upon the report of the Committee that the House would decide. It was a mere matter of form after all, and it did not matter whether the notice or the motion was referred to the Committee.<sup>18</sup>

MR. BROWN wanted to know if when hon. members made a motion, an entry was placed upon the journal, that such and such a motion was made?<sup>19</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said the decis[i]on would be made upon the report of the Committee.<sup>20</sup>

MR. BROWN apprehended it was very desirable that a motion made for a large quantity of printing to be done, ought to be referred to the Committee.<sup>21</sup>

MR. FERRES.--Did not see what difficulty could arise. Any hon. gentleman when the report of the committee comes up, would see whether the printing committee had done him justice in recommending those parts to be printed that the hon. gentleman wished, and if he was dissatisfied when the report came up, he could state so to the House.<sup>22</sup>

The motion was carried.<sup>23</sup>

(89)

*On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Cayley,*

*Ordered, That all motions for printing be, as a matter of course, referred by the Speaker to the Standing Committee on Printing, whose duty it shall be to report upon the expediency of printing the same, in whole or in part, the substance or extracts, and the number of copies, with an estimate of the cost of such printing.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Marchildon have leave to bring in a Bill to authorize the Creditors of Public Officers to seize and take in execution after judgment, the salaries and emoluments of the said officers, in certain cases.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

MR. CAMERON, who was absent when the notices of motions were gone through, with the permission of the house introduced two bills, which were read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on the 18th instant.<sup>24</sup>

(89)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law of Partnership.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday, the eighteenth instant.*

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cameron have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Law of Limited Liability.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday, the eighteenth instant.*

*The Order of the day, for the House in Committee on the Bill to change the tenure of the Indian Lands in the Township of Durham, being read;*

*(90)*

*Ordered, That the said Order of the day be postponed until Wednesday next.*

The only thing in the orders of the day was the second reading of several Bills, but as there was only one of them printed,<sup>25</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND at a quarter past five, the notice paper being exhausted, moved that the House do now adjourn.<sup>26</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said he had taken a different course this year from what he had done in former years. He had not brought forward a single measure, waiting to see when those gentlemen who accused him of taking up the time of the House would bring on theirs. But he had waited for this in vain. One day they had some personal matters occupying the House till four o'clock in the morning, but on days for business, this gentleman and the other gentleman was (sic) not ready, and they had to adjourn after sitting for a couple of hours. He thought he would go back to the old system and bring in measures himself as before.<sup>27</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that, since the debate (sic) on the address closed, they had got through a great deal of business, having done as much in a few hours, as at other times in as many days.<sup>28</sup>

*(90)*

*Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by Mr. Felton,  
The House adjourned.<sup>29</sup>*

APPENDIX: 3 MARCH 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: MUNICIPAL DEBENTURES OF THE COUNTY OF TERREBONNE.]

MR. A. DORION [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move an] Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House--

1. A statement of all the Municipal Debentures of the County of Terrebonne, which have been exchanged by the Government for Provincial Debentures, bearing the guarantee of the Municipal Loan Fund of Lower Canada, or on which advances have been made out of the said Fund.

2. The description or form of the said Municipal Debentures, and of the Provincial Debentures given in exchange therefor.

3. The names of the persons with whom the said Debentures were exchanged, and the days on which the said Provincial Debentures were delivered to the bearers of the Municipal Debentures.

4. Copies of all by-laws, orders of the Municipal Council, or orders of His Excellency in Council in virtue of which the said exchange took place, or the said advances were made, in short, copies of all correspondence between the Government or the Receiver General, and the officers of the Municipality and the employés of the Montreal and Bytown Railway Company, and generally, copies of all correspondence having reference to the exchange of the said Debentures.<sup>30</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.]

MR. MACKENZIE [gave notice that he would move] to Resolve, that the best interests of Upper and Lower Canada would be promoted by a repeal or dissolution of the political or legislative union now subsisting between these sections of the Province of Canada.<sup>31</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE RE: COMMON SCHOOL FUND.]

MR. MERRITT [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move] for the appointment of a Committee to examine into the amount and resources now applicable to the Fund for the support of Common Schools, and the establishment of District or Parish Libraries; also, the sources which can be made available for that object, with power to send for persons and papers.<sup>32</sup>

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A COMMITTEE RE: COASTING TRADE.]

MR. MERRITT [gave notice that] on Wednesday next [he would move] for the appointment of a Committee to investigate the state of the Coasting Trade, Manufacturing and Shipping Interests, and the state of the Commerce of this Province generally, with power to send for persons and papers.<sup>33</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR 1855.]

MR. FERRIE enquired of the ministry when the public accounts for last year would be laid before this House?<sup>34</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said that ... the public accounts will be sent to the printers on Wednesday or the day following, after which three weeks or a month would

be required before they could be laid before the House. They would, however, be thus laid before the House very much earlier than they had ever been before. It must be remembered that these accounts were made up to the 5th January, and he thought great despatch had been made in preparing them so speedily.<sup>35</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: APPROPRIATION FOR SCHOOL-HOUSES IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. JOBIN enquired of the Ministry, whether it is their intention to make any appropriation to enable them to fulfil their engagements towards the School Commissioners who did not receive their share of the sum granted for the purpose of erecting school-houses, the sum previously voted having proved insufficient in amount.<sup>36</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND replied that there was to be an appropriation made to the general purposes of education--not specially for the purpose of erecting school-houses, though, perhaps, some portion of the appropriation might be applied to that<sup>37</sup> if there is an overplus.<sup>38</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: PAYMENT OF JURORS IN UPPER CANADA.]

MR. POWELL enquired of the Ministry, whether it is their intention to carry out the understanding upon which the sum of 5,000L was granted from the consolidated revenue last year, for the payment of Jurors in Lower Canada, by granting an equivalent sum to Upper Canada, and how it is proposed to distribute such equivalent?<sup>39</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND replied.--As to the intention of the ministry to carry out that understanding, I can assure my hon. friend that it will be carried out. As to the mode in which the distribution will be made, that is a matter still under consultation.<sup>40</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR A BILL RE: AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN LOWER CANADA.]

MR. BELLINGHAM introduced a Bill to amend the Act 16 Vic., c. 18, to provide for the better organization of Agricultural Societies in Lower Canada, so as to extend its provisions to the present county of Argenteuil.<sup>41</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said the Government intended to bring in a measure to extend the provisions of that Act to all the new counties. The hon. member might however, introduce the Bill.<sup>42</sup>

[The motion] was withdrawn.<sup>43</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: RE-ANNEXATION OF UNSETTLED LANDS TO THE CROWN DOMAIN.]

DR. T. FORTIER (Nicolet) moved an Address to his Excellency the Governor General, praying him to be pleased to cause all the Crown Lands which have been granted to certain individuals by Patents or otherwise, with respect to which the conditions specified by the said Patents have not been fulfilled, to be re-annexed to the Crown Domain.<sup>44</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that the Government had no power to do any such thing, or to take any man's property from him<sup>45</sup>, until it had been clearly proven in a court of justice that the grantee had not fulfilled the conditions of his patent.

If the conditions of the patent had not been fulfil[l]ed, and that the fact was established, it would be a sufficient reason for recalling the patents. But if the hon. gentleman<sup>46</sup> meant that the Government could by an Order in Council declare that 10,000, or 15,000, or 20,000 acres of land, not settled, but granted 20 or 30 years ago, should be re-annexed to the Crown Domain--a Government which would do any such thing would only expose itself to ridicule. The Government had not that power; it was possessed by the tribunals alone.<sup>47</sup> He therefore hoped his hon. friend would not pres[s] his motion.<sup>48</sup>

DR. T. FORTIER was sorry to dissent from the Attorney General. He believed the Crown had the right and power to act, as his motion proposed, for he maintained that the conditions of the Patents had not been fulfilled. The lands had been given to partisans of former Governments when Lower Canada was under military law, and the conditions never had been fulfilled.<sup>49</sup> He read the conditions of several patents to show that the grantees were bound to have their lands settled within a year. Some 1,500,000 acres had been granted in this manner, and held contrary to Imperial Orders in Council. A half century (sic) had passed, and these conditions remained unfulfilled, and many of the lands unsettled. It was true, a Court had at one time existed, but had not been properly worked, and failed to give the people the remedy they sought. The Hon. member cited Blackstone, to show that the Crown might, at any time, resume possession of lands, the conditions of the grants of which had remained unfulfilled. He also quoted two enactments from the old French Government of Canada, authorising the same course; one of them, March, 1663.<sup>50</sup> It had been said, he continued, that the Lower Canadians were few in number and backward in intelligence. But French Canadians do not take notice of the multifarious slanders, calumnies and false statements, so industriously propagated in order to depreciate their moral character and political importance. Whatever the rank of such men may be, the people of the Lower Province only look upon them as the vilest of the vile--the mere scum of society. It was well known that Lower Canada had progressed through the intelligence and enterprise of its inhabitants; and had they not been forced to immigrate in consequence of the bad management of the public lands in former times, their number would now equal, if not exceed, that of Upper Canada--the population of which had been augmented by an admixture of white and colored people. But, to revert to the subject of this motion, he would say that when the Government gave a quantity of land to certain parties--no matter what were the conditions of the grant, they had a perfect right, in the event of the non-fulfilment of the conditions, to retake those lands. If the patentee held the land and refused to cultivate it--and by so doing retarded the march of civilization--was it not right that he should forfeit it? How much more so, when we see people obtaining some 60,000 acres of land, who positively refuse to cultivate it themselves, or let settlers establish themselves on it and cultivate it? Like the dog in the manger, they not only declined making any improvements themselves, but also refused to allow others to do so. The Government had, he would repeat it, a perfect right, under the circumstances, to cancel all these patents and re-unite the lands to the Crown domain.<sup>51</sup> Any action taken to prevent this would be directly contrary to the best interests of Lower Canada, as tending to prevent the settlement of the country.<sup>52</sup> He thought an order of this House was quite sufficient to take away the lands. Was not the law of this House supreme? If this House declared that those men had forfeited their lands, were they not forfeited? (Laughter.) Was not this House supreme? (Hear, hear.) He was surprised that he had met with any opposition to the motion. He had thought that he should have got the support of gentlemen from Lower Canada. He had not expected discussion or that he would meet with any opposition. He could do nothing more now than leave the subject to the sense of the House.<sup>53</sup>

MR. ROBINSON thought something more might be done than leaving it to the sense of the House. The House could not assist the hon. gentleman in interfering with the Patents, but the remedy was very simple. Let the wild lands be taxed in Lower Canada as they were in Upper Canada,<sup>54</sup> and he would give his word for it, the present proprietors would be very glad to cultivate them or else dispose of them as quickly as possible. This tax was already in force in some districts, and would be here after, in many others. Such a course would speedily obviate the difficulty.<sup>55</sup> But he supposed his hon. friend and his neighbors had such a horror of the word taxation, that they would hardly adopt his remedy.<sup>56</sup> But to pass an Act doing away with a man's title to his land was going rather too far.<sup>57</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND fully sympathised with the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortier) as to evils arising from the large tracts of land uncultivated in Lower Canada.<sup>58</sup> And it was to be regretted that proceedings were not adopted at an early period of the settlement of the country to compel the fulfilment of the conditions of settlement in the patents, and there could be no doubt that, although the grants were made for the purpose of settlement, that settlement had not yet taken place<sup>59</sup>, and nothing had ... been done to remedy this evil. If it were yet time, and the Government could legally set aside those patents, they would do so. But he put it to the hon. gentleman whether that very desirable reform had been demanded fairly, or not? Could the Government comply with that demand? Surely that hon. gentleman did not mean to aver that a person might go and forcibly take from another, land which he had legally acquired. Neither, then, could Government go and take possession of this land.<sup>60</sup> An order in Council for the course suggested would be so much waste paper. The Crown must proceed like an individual in a case of this sort, to establish the non-fulfilment of the condition and the consequent lapse of the title before a Court of Justice. In every case where the hon. member or any one else would make out a case against any one for a title, the crown would be ready to proceed.<sup>61</sup> [But] until it had been fully proved in a court of justice that the obligations of the patentees had not been carried out, no patents that had been granted could be declared null and void.<sup>62</sup> They did not differ as to the cause of complaint, or as to the remedy, but simply as to the means by which that remedy should be applied. It was clear that this could not be done by a proclamation, and he conceived that he would be supported by all the lawyers in the House, when he said it could only be done by means of an action.<sup>63</sup> The best remedy would be, he considered, that mentioned by his hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) to tax the uncultivated lands. It had already, as was stated, been applied in one<sup>64</sup> Lower Canada County (Drummond)<sup>65</sup> where a large proportion of the patentees were almost entirely unknown--and the lands lying waste and profitless. But so soon as the tax was laid on, all these blank lots speedily found owners, if not occupiers and cultivators. That was, he considered, the speediest way of settling the matter. In conclusion, he would merely say, that the Government were willing and anxious to serve his hon. friend in this matter, in any way in their power.<sup>66</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE spoke to the same effect as the Attorney General.<sup>67</sup>

MR. TURCOTTE thought the matter could only be decided in a court of justice.<sup>68</sup> [He] said that the intervention of the Government had never been refused to settlers who had settled on their lands where it could be shown the title of the party interfering with their possession had lapsed from non-fulfilment of its conditions.<sup>69</sup>

DR. T. FORTIER said that if the Government intended to take action on the subject, he had no difficulty in withdrawing the motion.<sup>70</sup>

The motion was then withdrawn.<sup>71</sup>

[WITHDRAWN ENQUIRIES RE: ADDRESSES TO HER MAJESTY PASSED IN 1855 RELATIVE TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND TO DEBTS.]

MR. CAMERON had on the notice paper two enquiries of the Ministry, as follows:--

Enquiry of Ministry, whether any and what answer has been received to the Address of this House to Her Most Gracious Majesty, on the subject of the removal of certain disabilities under which the Church of England labored in this colony?

Enquiry of Ministry, whether any and what answer has been received to the Address of this House to Her Most Gracious Majesty, on the subject of the repeal of various British Statutes in reference to the reception of evidence by affidavits in this Province?<sup>72</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND asked if the hon. member for Toronto would allow them to be struck off, as there was no hope of the Ministry being in a position to give a final answer for some time.<sup>73</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--On the subject of the reception of evidence by affidavits, I understand there have been some communications received by the Government. Have there not?<sup>74</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--I am not aware. As to the other question, there have been communications, but they are not yet complete.<sup>75</sup>

MR. CAMERON.--I look upon that as a matter of very great importance, but I have no objection to strike them both off, if the Government will give me an answer within a fortnight or three weeks.<sup>76</sup> He did not wish to lose sight of them, although for the present this might be struck from the list.<sup>77</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE CROWN LANDS DEPARTMENT.]

[On the subject of the] Address for orders in Council relative to any change which may have taken place in the Crown Lands Department,<sup>78</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND asked if the hon. gentleman [Mr. J.S. Macdonald] would consent to move the Address without a Debate. If so, he was prepared on the part of the Government to consent to it.<sup>79</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said, as he had postponed his motion before in consequence of the absence of the Hon. the Crown Land Commissioner, he would rather that hon. gentleman were in his place, as<sup>80</sup> perhaps he might give explanations which would render it unnecessary.<sup>81</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CHARGES AGAINST DR. MCCAUL.]

MR. HARTMAN moved an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of the proceedings and report of the Commissioners appointed by His Excellency to enquire into certain charges against the Rev. John McCaul, L.L.D., Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto. In moving the Address, the hon. member stated that it was his earnest hope that Dr. McCaul's character had been triumphantly cleared by the investigation, and he was desirous, therefore, that the fullest information should be laid before the House.<sup>82</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY requested the hon. member to postpone his motion, till the Attorney-General West should be in his place.<sup>83</sup>

Before the House adjourned,  
MR. HARTMAN again brought forward the motion<sup>84</sup>.

At the request of MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH,<sup>85</sup>

[MR. HARTMAN] postponed it till to-morrow (Tuesday).<sup>86</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: TAVERN LICENSES.]

On the notice of motion of Mr. Dorion, (Montreal), to take into consideration certain resolutions to amend the mode of issuing Tavern Licenses, with a view to the suppression of intemperance,<sup>87</sup>

MR. A. DORION said he understood, since giving that notice, that some hon. gentlemen were preparing amendments to the law in this respect, and although he was ready, yet, out of deference to these gentlemen, he would defer the question for a day or two.<sup>88</sup>

MR. HARTMAN said that he had given notice of some amendments on this question, but since then a committee has been appointed, and he understood that a sub-committee had been appointed to prepare a series of resolutions; and, at their request, he wished this question postponed till Wednesday.<sup>89</sup>

MR. A. DORION said his intention was to move certain amendments to the mode of issuing Tavern Licenses; but as these honorable gentlemen consider that a Maine Law is required, and wished to bring in resolutions to that effect, he would not proceed with his motion at present.<sup>90</sup>

[The motion was] postponed.<sup>91</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR RESOLUTIONS RE: EDUCATION IN LOWER CANADA.]

On the notice of motion by Mr. Dorion (Montreal,) to take into consideration the following resolutions on the subject of Education in Lower Canada:--

1st. That notwithstanding the progress of Education in Lower Canada during the last few years, experience has shewn that the laws now in force providing for Elementary Education in Lower Canada are insufficient to place public instruction on a par with the wants of the population of that portion of the Province, and to insure a correct system of Elementary Education.

2nd. That no system of education can operate in Lower Canada in an advantageous manner without energetic and assiduous superintendence by means of a General Council of Public Education, assisted by Special Councils in each District of the Province, and without an active and enlightened direction by Inspectors acting in each Judicial District of Lower Canada.

3rd. That the want of qualified School Teachers is one of the chief causes of the slow progress of education in Lower Canada, and that in order to provide for the deficiency now felt, it is expedient to make provision forthwith for the formation of Normal Schools.

4th. That the establishment of Public Libraries should be encouraged, as being one of the means for imparting a taste for education throughout all classes of society, and that annual appropriations should be made for that purpose.

5th. That the annual grant for the support of Elementary Education is insufficient, and that it ought to be increased.<sup>92</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, said until the House had in its possession the Report of the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada, which would be printed in a very short time, they could not proceed with this subject.<sup>93</sup> [He] hoped that the hon. member for Montreal would not press the government, as they had a measure in hand for accomplishing the objects contemplated by the hon. member's motion.<sup>94</sup> On the whole, it would be most convenient, he thought, to postpone the subject.<sup>95</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--If Government will come down with a measure embracing these resolutions, he had no objection to drop the question. His only object was to test the Government upon these points. He would, however, withdraw his resolutions upon the understanding that Government would bring in a measure embracing the whole subject of Education in Lower Canada.<sup>96</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said, it would be impossible for the government to give such an assurance, but he could say that it was the intention of the government to bring down a measure touching education, and having particular reference to Normal Schools.<sup>97</sup> But they desire that the Report of the Superintendent of Education in Lower Canada be first laid before the House. The Government have not all the information they want. The Superintendent has only been in his office three or four months and he has lost no time in bringing up his Report, which appears a very valuable document. The Government, therefore, stand pledged to bring in a measure on the subject of Education in Lower Canada; but to pledge the Government to bring in a measure embracing the resolutions of the hon. member is a different thing.<sup>98</sup>

MR. A. DORION had no wish for the Government so to do, but the principles embodied in his resolutions had been asked for by the Superintendent of Education for the last four or five years in his several reports, and they had been acknowledged by the Report of a Committee of which the Hon. Attorney-General and Provincial Secretary formed a part, and had been asked for by the country by petitions. Upon these grounds he did not see that it required a long time for the administration to make up their mind. He wanted to test the opinion of the House upon the subject.<sup>99</sup> He would have no objection, however, in withdrawing his resolutions until Wednesday; but he certainly would test the House upon each of the resolutions of which he had given notice.<sup>100</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND had already told the House what Government intended to do. The hon. gentleman might judge what was best for him to do. If the hon. gentleman pressed his motion to go into committee, however, he would move in amendment that the House go into Committee this day month.<sup>101</sup>

MR. A. DORION said he had two series of resolutions; one to go into Committee of the Whole, and the other to proceed before the House. His intention now was, to proceed before the House. The resolutions were founded upon suggestions laid before it in 1853 and 1854, and in which the present Speaker had taken part.<sup>102</sup> He wished all these points introduced in any Bill brought down by Government, and he would therefore withdraw his resolutions for 15 days.<sup>103</sup>

The matter was finally postponed for fifteen days, until the Government received information upon the subject.<sup>104</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 3 MARCH 1856.

1. GLOBE, 4 March 1856, reports Mr. Hartman presented this petition.
2. LE PAYS, 11 March 1856, provides a commentary on this petition, first presented by Mr. J. Dorion on the 18th February 1856: "Le gouvernement, après quinze jours de réflexions et de délibérations, s'est décidé à laisser recevoir et lire sans opposition, sans même faire une seule remarque, la requête des habitants de l'Avenir demandant un conseil législatif électif, un gouverneur électif et le rappel de Sir Edmund Head. Le gouvernement tory a prouvé qu'il avait bien la pensée, le désir de priver les habitants de ce pays du droit de requête qui est un droit sacré du sujet anglais, puisqu'il a retardé pendant deux semaines la réception de cette requête et que ses organes ont insulté et ceux qui l'avaient signée et celui qui l'avait présentée; mais il a cru probablement qu'il n'était pas assez fort pour commettre impunément une pareille violation du droit de sujet, et après mûre délibération de la part des maîtres, et grand tapage de la part des valets, la requête a été reçue et lue tout comme une requête ordinaire; les ministres ont même fait semblant de ne pas s'en apercevoir. Il eût pourtant été bien amusant de voir les hommes qui composent le gouvernement actuel essayer de nier aux citoyens de ce pays un droit qui leur est garanti par la constitution, et qu'aucun gouvernement anglais n'oserait mettre en doute un seul instant; ce qu'il ne pourrait d'ailleurs faire qu'au sacrifice de son existence. Mais s'ils ne l'ont pas fait, c'est parce qu'ils ne l'ont pas osé, car il est certain que leur servilisme pour Sir Edmund Head ne connaît point de limites; ceux du Bas-Canada surtout en ont donné la preuve en s'inclinant devant celui qui insultait leurs compatriotes; ils ont prouvé que pour eux les places et l'argent passent avant l'honneur." Exceptionally, the text of the petition has been reprinted in full in MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
3. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
4. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
5. IBID.
6. IBID.
7. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
8. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
9. IBID.
10. IBID.
11. IBID.
12. IBID.
13. IBID.
14. IBID.
15. IBID.
16. IBID.
17. IBID.
18. IBID.
19. IBID.
20. IBID.
21. IBID.
22. IBID.
23. IBID.
24. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
25. IBID.
26. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
27. IBID.

28. GLOBE, 4 March 1856. In a commentary, MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, states that "last Tuesday and Monday the Assembly sat a couple of hours, or so. Played in the forenoon--commenced business at three--shut up at or near to five--500 persons, members, clerks, witnesses, petitioners--all idle--at a fearful cost."
29. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856, reports the House "adjourned at quarter past five P.M."
30. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 11 March 1856.
31. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856.
32. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 11 March 1856.
33. IBID.
34. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
35. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856).
36. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
37. IBID.
38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
39. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
40. IBID.
41. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
42. IBID.
43. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856).
44. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
45. IBID.
46. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
47. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
48. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
49. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
50. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
51. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
52. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
53. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
54. IBID.
55. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
56. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
57. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
58. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
59. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
60. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
61. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
62. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
63. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
64. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
65. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
66. HAMILTON SPECTATOR SEMI-WEEKLY, 5 March 1856.
67. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
68. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
69. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 5 March 1856).
70. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
71. IBID.
72. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
73. IBID.
74. IBID.
75. IBID.

76. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
78. IBID.
79. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
80. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
81. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
82. IBID.
83. IBID.
84. IBID.
85. IBID.
86. GLOBE, 4 March 1856. In its synopsis of debate, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856, gives conflicting information and reports the motion was withdrawn after Mr. Cayley replied that "the Report and the evidence could be found in the Attorney General's office."
87. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
88. IBID.
89. IBID.
90. IBID.
91. IBID.
92. IBID.
93. IBID.
94. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
95. Telegraph (MONTREAL GAZETTE, 4 March 1856).
96. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
97. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
98. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
99. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
100. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
101. IBID.
102. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.
103. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 4 March 1856.
104. GLOBE, 4 March 1856.

TUESDAY, 4 MARCH 1856.

(90)

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House,--Returns from the Registrars of the Counties of Prince Edward and Durham, pursuant to the Act 16 Vic., cap. 187, sec. 9, for the year 1855.

For the said Returns, see Appendix (No. 3.)

The following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By the Honorable Mr. Young,--The Petition of Albert Furniss, of the City of Montreal.

By Mr. Polette,--The Petition of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Three Rivers and others, the Committee of Management of the Schools of the Society of Education; and the Petition of Abraham Dubuc and others, of L'Isle de la Fourche, and of the Parish of Ste. Monique.

By the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab,--The Petition of William P. McLaren and others; and the Petition of M.P. Empey and others, Merchants, Manufacturers, and others, of the Village of Waterloo, County of Waterloo.

By the Honorable Mr. Cayley,--The Petition of H. Haynes and others; the Petition of D. Shoff and others, of the Village of Ireland, County of Huron; and the Petition of the Town Council of the Town of Goderich.

By the Honorable Mr. Merritt,--The Petition of J.P. Abbey and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland.

By Mr. Labelle,--The Petition of the Reverend J.G. Watier, Curé, and others, School Commissioners and others, of the Parish of St. François de Sales, Isle Jésus; and the Petition of the Reverend M.J.E. Chévigny, Curé, and others, of the Parish of St. Henry de Mascouche, County of L'Assomption.

By Mr. Stevenson,--The Petition of W. Turner, senior, and others, of the Township of Marysburgh, County of Prince Edward; and the Petition of John Stephenson and others, of the Town of Picton.

By Mr. Hartman,--The Petition of John Anderson and others, of the Township of Whitchurch, County of York.

By Mr. Church,--The Petition of James G. Elwood and others, of the Township of Oxford, County of Grenville.

By Mr. Chisholm,--The Petition of P.W. Dayfoot and others, of the Township of Esquesing, County of Halton.

By Mr. Ferrie,--The Petition of A. Ainslie and others, of the Village of Galt, County of Waterloo.

By Mr. Jobin,--The Petition of L'Institut d'Artisans et Association de Bibliothèque, of the Village of Industrie, County of Joliette; and the Petition of Léandre Mayrand and others, Pilots engaged in the navigation between Quebec and Montreal.

By the Honorable John Sandfield Macdonald,--The Petition of Thomas Clarkson and others, Merchants and others, of the City of Toronto, and of the Counties of York and Simcoe.

(91)

By Mr. Bell,--The Petition of Alexander Yuill and others, of the Township of Ramsay, County of Lanark.

By Mr. Biggar,--The Petition of W.H. Dunning and others, of the Township of Cumberland, County of Russell.

By Mr. Roderick McDonald,--The Petition of Mrs. Louisa Cherley and others, of the Township of Cornwall, County of Stormont.

By Mr. Loranger,--The Petition of Les Soeurs de la Congrégation, Directresses of the Convent of St. Hyacinthe; the Petition of the Municipal Council of the County of Bagot; the Petition of the Reverend F.H. Prévost and others, Catholic School Commissioners of the City of Montreal; the Petition of the Reverend J.N. Trudel and others, School Commissioners and others, of the Parish of St. Isidore, County of Laprairie; and the Petition of the Reverend S. Morin and others, of the Parish of St. Jacques le Mineur.

By Mr. Rhodes,--The Petition of the Rector and Churchwardens of the Parish of Quebec.

By the Honorable Mr. Robinson,--The Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Tecumseth, County of Simcoe.

Mr. Jobin, from the Standing Committee on Contingencies, presented to the House the first Report of the said Committee, which was read as followeth:--

Your Committee have made progress in the examination of the Account Current of the Clerk, from the 31st March, 1855, the date of the last Audit, to the 31st December, 1855.

Your Committee beg leave also to recommend that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to issue His Warrant in favor of the Clerk of this House for the sum of Ten thousand pounds, towards defraying the Contingent Expenses of this House.

Sur motion de MR. JOBIN,<sup>1</sup>

(91)

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to issue His Warrant in favor of William Burns Lindsay, Esquire, the Clerk of this House, for the sum of Ten thousand pounds, currency, towards defraying the Contingent Expenses of this House; and assuring His Excellency that this House will make good the same.

Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.

Mr. Sidney Smith, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented to the House the Third Report of the said Committee, which was read, as followeth:--

Your Committee have examined the following Petitions, and find that sufficient Notice has been given in each case, viz:--Of Horace Capron and others, of the Township of South Dumfries, relative to a certain Road allowance in that Township; of James Taunton, of the Township of Southwold, relative to a road allowance; of Robert H. Barlow, late of Blackheath, London, England, now of Brantford, in the Province of Canada, on behalf of himself and others, for incorporation of the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway Company; of John Watson, of the Village of Ayr, County of Waterloo, relative to the construction of a water-course; of P.C. Vanbrocklin, of the Town of Brantford, County of Brant, for incorporation of the Canada and Liverpool Mining Company; of the Reverend T. Caron and others, of the Parish of Ste. Monique, for incorporation of a Bridge Company; of James Cockburn and others, of the Township of Hamilton, relative to a Concession line; and of the Municipal Council of the

(92)

United Counties of Huron and Bruce, for the confirmation of a Deed of conveyance by the Town Council of Goderich, of a portion of the Market Square on which the Court House is erected.

*On the Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the City of Montreal, for repeal of the Act of last Session, amending their Act of Incorporation, Your Committee find that no Notice has been given, but the matter of the present application having been fully discussed in the City Council, whose proceedings are reported in the City papers, Your Committee are of opinion that the Notice is sufficient.*

*The Petition of the Mount Pleasant Seminary Association, for an Act of Incorporation, is not of such a nature as to require the publication of Notice.*

MR. JACKSON moved, That the return from his Excellency, relative to the withdrawal from sale of certain lands in the counties of Grey and Bruce, should be referred to the Printing Committee.<sup>2</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said, it was desirable that the whole of the papers should be published. There had been a good deal of public feeling upon it, and it was necessary to bring a measure before the country as full and broad as possible in order to understand where the blame, if any, lay.<sup>3</sup>

(92)

*Ordered, That the Return to an Address of the 19th February last, relating to the withdrawal from sale of certain lands in the County of Grey and Bruce, be referred to the Standing Committee on Printing, with a view to the publication of the whole or a part thereof.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Bellingham have leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the erection of a new Circuit in the District of Ottawa, to be called the Argenteuil Circuit.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday, the twenty-fourth instant.*

MR. CHRISTIE introduced a Bill to vest in Horace Capron and Myron Ames the allowance for roads between lots No. 30 and 31 in the second Concession, Township of Dumfries.<sup>4</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said, perhaps the hon. member might allow that motion to stand. Perhaps, the hon. member knew that there has been some opposition to that Bill. He would take an early opportunity to see the hon. gentleman, and, perhaps, some arrangement might be made to accommodate the different parties.<sup>5</sup>

MR. CHRISTIE said that he was aware of the opposition, but the Bill had been before the Committee on private Bills, and they had all the facts before them, and had reported this Bill to-day. He had, therefore, upon that Report introduced it.<sup>6</sup>

(92)

*Ordered, That Mr. Christie have leave to bring in a Bill to vest a certain road allowance in Horace Capron and Myron Ames.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Macbeth have leave to bring in a Bill to vest in James Tainton, a part of original allowance for road between lot number forty, on Talbot Road, east, and number ten, in second range, east of River Road, in the Township of Southwold.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Thursday next.*

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND introduced a Bill to provide a uniform mode of incorporating societies for Religious, Charitable and Educational purposes.<sup>7</sup>

MR. [A. OR J.] DORION wished to know the particular import of the Bill.<sup>8</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND ... stated that the principal object of the measure was, to enable persons to associate themselves together for charitable or benevolent purposes, and that they should enjoy the same rights as any private institutions. The bill embraced corporations for the construction of places for public worship, public libraries, colleges and educational establishments<sup>9</sup>; also corporations for the purpose of establishing any asylum or place of public refuge<sup>10</sup>. With regard to the amount of property which each of these institutions would be entitled to hold, and as to the limitation of the amount, these would come up for discussion before the House at the proper period. It was proposed to limit the amount of freehold property which these societies would hold, and to some extent their personal property. Some distinction, however, would have to be made between these institutions. They should not all be allowed to hold any more property than is required for their own purposes. Public libraries, or such corporations as might be got up for promoting the fine arts, ought to be permitted to hold large amounts of property, and in regard to institutions for the deaf and dumb, or charitable institutions of that kind, a scale would be established regulating their rights to hold the same.<sup>11</sup>

MR. BROWN asked, in what manner the parties would be benefited by the Bill?<sup>12</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said all that would be explained when the bill came up for its second reading. It was not usual to enter upon the explanation of all details when introducing a measure.<sup>13</sup>

MR. BROWN urged that a bill of this importance should be explained at once. If the hon. gentleman could do so, he would like to hear him.<sup>14</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said it would be time enough when the measure came up for discussion.<sup>15</sup>

(92)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond have leave to bring in a Bill to provide a uniform mode of incorporating societies formed for religious, charitable, and educational purposes.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD brought in a bill "to amend, repeal and consolidate the provisions of certain acts therein mentioned, and to simplify and expedite the proceedings in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Upper Canada." In explanation of the measure, the hon. gentleman said: He might inform hon. gentlemen on the other side, and his professional friends in the House, generally, that this bill incorporates all the late improvements and recommendations for improvements, in the Common Law; for instance, compulsory arbitration, allowing the Courts to order parties to go to arbitration, and extending the power to the Court as much as

possible. All the late improvements up to the very last session of 1855, had been adopted in this bill, and adapted to the circumstances of the country.<sup>16</sup>

MR. WILSON enquired if the hon. gentleman intended to put enough in the bill with reference to a more easy mode of making money on executions?<sup>17</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied that he had not incorporated that in the bill. It was a separate subject, and standing by itself. It was proposed in England, that the Scotch system should be used, and when a party renders himself liable under a note or bond, that that should be considered in the way of a cognovit, and that judgment should issue at once thereupon, leaving it to the party if he thought fit to apply for a suspension of process. That objection had been strongly pressed in England, but it had never got so far yet, and he did not wish by this bill to go farther than to follow those principles as they might be adapted to our wants. He thought that when amendments to the law were made in England, after much deliberation by the whole profession before any act takes place, that we should follow in their tracks. We should not precede them by adopting that system. The proceedings of the Courts in England upon statutes were authorities at once to give confidence to us to adopt them in bringing in any new law.<sup>18</sup>

(92)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald have leave to bring in a Bill to amend, repeal, and consolidate the provisions of certain Acts therein mentioned, and to simplify and expedite the proceedings in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Upper Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD brought in a bill to amend so much of the statute 12 Vict. cap. 63, as relates to the constitution of the Court of Error and Appeal, and said, the object of this bill was this--The Court of Appeal in Upper Canada was composed of the judges in law and equity, viz: the Court of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas and Court of Error. He proposed to give the Government power of calling upon a retired judge to become a member of that body; and particularly in the present instance to ask the late Chief Justice Macaulay who had retired, as is well known, but who is quite willing to act as Judge of Appeals, and to give all the assistance he can in that official capacity. The bill did not contemplate calling upon all retired Judges and making them Judges of Appeal, because the case may happen that a Judge may retire from the bench, on account of being considered unfit for duty.<sup>19</sup> But this was not the case with Mr. Macaulay, who was quite able and willing to serve in this Court.... As there was no salary attached to the position,<sup>20</sup> no additional expense would be brought upon the country by the step proposed, but the late Chief Justice's presence would be much appreciated, as his loss had been much felt by the Judges, and he (Mr. Macdonald) was quite assured that his professional friends in the House would see the advantage of having this arrangement carried out.<sup>21</sup>

(92)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald have leave to bring*

(93)

*in a Bill to alter and amend so much of the Statute, 12 Vic., cap. 63, as relates to the constitution of the Court of Error and Appeal.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next.*

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY introduced a bill "to amend the act for establishing freedom of banking," and stated that in the act which had gone into operation on this subject, some difficulty had been produced by striking out a particular section of a clause which fixed the limit at which any individual should bank. The change as it then stood, from the very wording of it was imperfect.<sup>22</sup> The present Bill proposed to amend that clause by fixing<sup>23</sup> the limits of Joint Stock Banks, Individual Banks, and Associations for Banking, and then it went on to say that the one should be limited by the other, and introduces a limit of 25,000L on the individual banks. There was also another clause in the bill which required some alteration, which provides that bank notes shall bear upon the face of them the words, "payable at the office, and not elsewhere." It was not the purpose of the present Act to limit the liability of them. It was proposed to strike out the words "and not elsewhere," and substitute other words in lieu thereof.<sup>24</sup> At this moment there was a party anxious to avail himself of the privileges of banking under this very Banking Act, and he had his bills struck leaving out these words--unimportant in fact--out of the wording of his plate. He (the Inspector General) had been compelled under the directions of the Act to refuse his sanction to those Bills being issued in consequence of that omission. These two corrections formed the chief object of the Bill.<sup>25</sup>

MR. BROWN said that several important points with regard to the banking of the country had engaged public attention of late. Perhaps the honorable gentleman would say whether it was his intention to introduce any clauses into that Bill to meet these difficulties. In regard to the operation of the Usury Law, which he had the honor of introducing and carrying through three years ago, it had been found that the clauses which repeals (*sic*) the penalties of usury, were held not to apply to Banks. Another question has been raised with regard to whether Banks have a right to charge any commission upon inland Exchange? There were certain points rising out of that which would require to be attended to. There was another question now brought prominently before this country with regard to the change which has taken place in the Banking of this Province, in consequence of the large transactions with the United States and the consequent drain of gold from this country. He wished to know whether any of these questions would be touched upon in the bill now to be introduced?<sup>26</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY said, this bill did not touch upon the general question of banking at all. It merely contemplated amending the free Banking Act upon the two defective points to which he had alluded. At the present moment it was not the intention of Government to bring in any measure to that effect.<sup>27</sup>

(93)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cayley have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act for establishing the freedom of Banking.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Friday next.*

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY introduced a Bill to authorize the immediate commutation of claims on Ordnance land upon the transfer of such land to the Province. The hon. gentleman said that some years ago the Imperial Government proposed to locate a certain number of pensioners, upwards of 1,000, upon the Ordnance lands in Canada<sup>28</sup>--

the movement took place in 1850 or 1851<sup>29</sup>. The locations selected were Toronto, London, Niagara, Amherstburgh, Penetanguishene and Fort Erie. This locating of pensioners in Canada, was to a certain extent carried out, and pensioners under certain regulations were distributed at these different points. When the idea was entertained of transferring these Ordnance lands to the Provincial Government, it became necessary to make provision for the claims of the pensioners, and it was arranged by Mr. Hincks when he was in England that these pensioners should be commuted with at the rate of 4L per head per annum during the period of their lives. This commutation was carried into effect with five hundred of the pensioners, those of them who occupied the Reserves at Toronto, London, and Niagara<sup>30</sup>, making altogether, for the 500 pensioners, 2,000L per annum.<sup>31</sup> The Government had not yet possession of these ordnance lands. This bill was therefore in anticipation of the Government having the control of them, subject to their satisfying these claims of the pensioners. There were 500 of the latter on the list at present. He proposed also to extend the operation of the act<sup>32</sup> to the pensioners located at Amherstburgh, Penetanguishene, and Fort Erie, provided the requisite arrangements can be made with the Home Government. It was the understanding of the Home Government that in the event of the transfer of those Ordnance Lands not being carried out, the money so advanced to the pensioners, commencing in 1853, should be refunded by the Imperial Government<sup>33</sup>; if they were, they were to go on paying it. The Government had been going on negotiating for the transfer of the Ordnance Lands, and the bill was intended for the payment of this commutation of the claims of pensioners upon those lands, whenever they were handed over to the Province.<sup>34</sup>

MR. BROWN asked the honourable gentleman to state whether the Bill applied exclusively to pensioners or to other persons claiming ordnance lands (sic), for instance, in respect to taking lands and chattels.<sup>35</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY.--It applies only to the pensioners.<sup>36</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) supposed that communications would be laid before the House in respect to these Commutations?<sup>37</sup>

MR. INSP. GEN. CAYLEY.--There will.<sup>38</sup>

(93)

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Cayley have leave to bring in a Bill to authorize the commutation of claims on Ordnance Lands, upon the transfer of such lands to the Province.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Friday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Poulin have leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the establishment of Superior Primary Schools in certain Parishes and Townships in Lower Canada.*<sup>39</sup>

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Poulin have leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the establishment of County Courts in Lower Canada.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.*

*The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to abolish the right of appeal in Her Majesty's Privy Council in certain cases, being read;*

*Mr. Charles Daoust moved, seconded by Mr. Prévost, and the question being proposed, That the Bill be now read a second time;*

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said he agreed in the principle on which the bill was based, but it should not be enacted as a separate measure, but form part of a general reform of the judicial system of Lower Canada<sup>40</sup>, which it was the intention of the Government at some future time to introduce.<sup>41</sup> Until the constitution of the Court of Appeal in Lower Canada was altered, he thought the appeal to the Privy Council should be allowed to subsist.<sup>42</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST would not press the measure if the Government was prepared to introduce a measure of general Jurisdiction Reform; but they might wait till the end of the session--perhaps till the end of next--and not get what had been so often promised.<sup>43</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said he would repeat what he had often said before,--he had never promised the Bill in any particular session. He had always said he thought the organization of a good municipal system should precede it; that had just been got into working order. A former measure, brought in in 1852, had been abandoned because the Council could not take it up so fully as it ought, being occupied with railway business. This session they would have a measure to subdivide the districts and build the Court-Houses. Next session a Judicature Bill and Code of Procedure; until the Court of Appeal was better constituted. He repeated he did not desire to abolish the Appeal, though he was in favor of the principle of the Bill.<sup>44</sup>

MR. C. DAOUST did not see that he should not refrain from Legislation to correct some abuses of the present system, while waiting for the municipal system, or for the building of court houses. The present Court of Appeals was made up of the best judges they could get in Lower Canada. The appeal to Great Britain was a most expensive and odious process, and an evil against which the people cried out, and he thought the sooner it was repealed the better.<sup>45</sup>

MR. LORANGER agreed with the hon. member in principle. The appeal to the Privy Council, from the Lower Canada Court, was useless; but the bill excepted all actions now pending. It would do no harm then, for the bill of the Attorney General would probably become law ere any hereafter instituted actions would be ripe for appeal to England. The insufficiency of the Court of Appeals was another reason for his opposition. Four Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench revised the judgments of a Court numbering fourteen judges.<sup>46</sup>

Cries of "no, no."<sup>47</sup>

[MR. LORANGER:] The hon. member for Montreal cried "no," but this was true, for, though the 14 Judges of the Superior Court did not sit together, yet that Court was made up of many Judges, and the four Judges of the Queen's Bench revised their decisions whenever they might sit.<sup>48</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) said it was very singular that both the hon. gentlemen who had spoken should oppose the bill, while they admitted that the change it was proposed to introduce was necessary.<sup>49</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--I did not go so far as that. I think it advisable that the right of appeal should be greatly limited--that it should be done away with in all matters where private interests alone are concerned. But I think it should be retained in cases affecting the rights of the Crown, or where the public interest is involved.<sup>50</sup>

MR. A. DORION said the object of the bill was to abolish it, as regards Lower Canada, in all cases except where the rights of the Crown were concerned--the very view urged by the Attorney General. And secondly, that it should not apply to cases now pending, which was actually urged as an objection to it by the member for Laprairie (Mr. Loranger.) It must be evident to every one that the system operated injuriously in Lower Canada. In the first place, a judgment was rendered by three Judges of the Superior Court. A case might then be taken to the Appeal Court, where a decision was given by other four Judges--who had made the laws of the country the study of their lives. It was then sent to the Privy Council in England, to Judges who knew nothing whatever of the French laws, and who were not therefore well qualified to judge of cases which depended on those laws. And the result was that scarcely a judgment came from the Privy Council that was good, unless where it confirmed the decision appealed from.<sup>51</sup> One decision in the Privy Council reversing the judgment of the Lower Canada Court of Appeals had been based upon the French Code, which had never been introduced into Canada, and was never law here. He believed they should do away with this.<sup>52</sup> The hon. gentleman then cited several cases in which the judgment of the Privy Counsel, had been utterly at variance with the facts of the cases--and went on to say that in many, if not most instances, their decision had been prejudicial to the interests of the country. That was sufficient proof that the operation of the law had been bad in its effects. If everybody complained of the decisions given by the Privy Council, that would of course constitute a good argument for the abolition of the right of appeal. And such was in reality the effect of most of the appeals to that tribunal. Other inconveniencies arising from the right of appeal, were the immense costs involved in it, as well as the delay which necessarily ensued. It was, besides, made an engine in the hands of the rich and powerful, to force the man of more limited means into compliance.<sup>53</sup> The effect of the law as it now stood, was to frustrate the ends of justice--inasmuch as the costs of an appeal was so high that the richest litigant was almost always sure to demand an appeal as the best means of causing his opponent to give in, rather than incur the vast expense of carrying the case to England.<sup>54</sup> This, it was well known, had been very often the case.<sup>55</sup> For his own part, he would rather have a case decided by the Chief Justice of Lower Canada alone, who knew the law of Lawer (sic) Canada, than by the whole Privy Council of England, who did not. It was a case analagous to its being supposed that Upper Canadians could be dragged in appeal cases to the Courts of France.<sup>56</sup> Under the circumstances, he did not see how the enactment of the proposed law would interfere with the administration of justice, and therefore he would record his vote in favor of the proposed measure.<sup>57</sup>

MR. LORANGER explained what he had said in reference to the Bill having a retrospective effect. He thought a retrospective clause should be inserted, for even in cases now pending there was no vested right of appeal to England.<sup>58</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND admitted that he did not think the distinguished Judges in the Privy Council were competent in all cases to set aside the decisions of men who had grown grey in the study of the law in Lower Canada. But in many cases they were merely called upon to decide according to the rules of English law. In those cases the right of appeal was correct, and especially in cases where the rights of the

Crown were concerned, that appeal should not be taken away. Although, therefore, he admitted the propriety of taking away the right of appeal in certain cases, he did not admit the propriety of taking it away in all.<sup>59</sup>

A voice.--These are excepted in the bill.<sup>60</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--A reform of this sort should not be made piece-meal; but the systems should be made homogeneous.<sup>61</sup> He would like to see some genius displayed in the amendment of our system, and would therefore object to any alterations being made at present. It had been already announced that a new system of judicature was contemplated by the Government; and until that system was introduced, he would oppose all such amendments as that now introduced. The hon. gentleman then referred to the measures which Government shortly proposed coming down with<sup>62</sup>. They intended this Session to introduce a bill having for its object the subdivision of Lower Canada into smaller court districts, and to enable municipalities to build Court Houses. It would take a couple of years to complete this, but whether completed or not, it was the intention of the Government to introduce a measure next session, to decentralize the judicial system, and to introduce a code of procedure, and this matter of appeals would be embraced in the one general plan.<sup>63</sup> The hon. gentleman then proceeded to say, that so long as the Court of Appeal, sitting in Lower Canada, was composed as it was, the right of appeal to England ought to be maintained. That court consisted of only four judges, and when they were divided in opinion, the decision of the court below was confirmed. Now, he thought it a very hard thing for an appellant, whose appeal had been decided against, although he might have as many judges for him as against him--or if he ever had but one judge in his favor--to be denied the right of appeal. And as the court was constituted now, he did not believe that suitors before the court, would desire to have the privilege of appeal taken away. With these observations he would suggest to hon. gentlemen the propriety of reflecting seriously before they voted for the Bill.<sup>64</sup> He moved an amendment that the bill should be read a second time that day six months.<sup>65</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD.--The argument of the hon. and learned Attorney-General would go far to convince the House that legislation on this point was necessary. He admitted the evils of the present system, yet he prevented the reform of these evils, and so far as he could see for no sufficient reason. The appeal was considered a grievance by the people of Lower Canada, and, he thought, the opinion of the great body of the people of Upper Canada was the same as that entertained in Lower Canada. How could the people hear of an appeal to England against great companies or monopolies, such as the Grand Trunk Railroad Company. Why should they be compelled to do it after a decision by the Upper Canada Bench which could not be too highly lauded? If the great evils admitted, did exist, why should the Government prevent its reform.<sup>66</sup> It was too much for the Attorney General, when he admitted the necessity for such a measure, to ask the House to throw out this bill, that the government might incorporate it with their general scheme at some undefined period. Would it not be better to allow it to pass the second reading, and if there were any objectionable features in it, these could be removed in committee by the Attorney General in consultation with the member who had introduced it.<sup>67</sup> The hon. gentleman concluded by declaring his intention of voting for the Bill.<sup>68</sup>

MR. DEWITT concurred in the remarks of the member for Glengarry. He was not inclined to wait for that halcyon period, when the Government should bring in their new measure, and would therefore vote for the Bill.<sup>69</sup>

MR. SANBORN said, with respect to what the Attorney General had said about the Lower Canada Court of Appeals, it only proved the necessity for its reform, not that the Appeal to Great Britain should subsist--nine-tenths of the cases were finally settled there, and if it operated as a hardship by its decisions, the harm in a great majority of cases would be done though the appeal[s] to England were not taken away. He did not think that appeal would afford any relief.--As for its being a reformation of the Judiciary by piecemeal, this appeal was in some sort detached from the rest of the system, and might be safely legislated on separately.<sup>70</sup> That hon. gentleman said ... that this measure would be introduced into his great scheme for altering the whole judicial system of Lower Canada. Now, he (Mr. S.) apprehended that it would not be wise in them to wait for that halcyon period, before making any improvement, for it was possible that it might not arrive for a very long time to come. The simple question was whether the right of appeal to the Privy Council was beneficial to the country or not, and he believed the House were quite as competent to determine that point now as ever they would be.<sup>71</sup> It was a hardship that after a man had got a majority of Lower Canada Judges in two Courts in his favor, a decision of men versed in the French law ruling there, their judgments should be revised and perhaps reversed by Judges in England, who, however talented, had not made that law their study.<sup>72</sup> He did not see any object to be gained by perpetrating what was admitted on all hands to be an erroneous system.<sup>73</sup>

MR. LABERGE said they had had the formal promise last session of a Judicature Bill. It was very well to say it was not promised for any particular session, but when a Minister made such a promise, it was understood to mean that it was to be fulfilled at the earliest possible moment. The Attorney General admitted this in saying the other night, that but for pressure of business and illness, he should have visited Louisiana to study personally the procedure there. If this bill only went into operation in two or three years, and the exception of cases now pending, would have the effect of suspending it for that time since the new cases would not be ready for appeal before then. The new Judges bill would come into operation at the same time with it. This appeal was now a practical déni de justice to many suitors in Lower Canada. The friends of the Government had no argument to oppose to the bill but their votes--the votes of men confessing the bill was right in principle.<sup>74</sup>

After some remarks from ... MR. LORANGER,<sup>75</sup>

MR. FELTON thought the reason[s] assigned by the hon. the Attorney General for Canada East, for the delay, were sufficiently cogent. They were told by him that Government would come down with a new measure, and that their best attention would be given to it; and he could not, therefore, see any reason for hon. gentlemen being in such a hurry. They had also been told by him that Government proposed sweeping changes, and he (Mr. F.) thought they had no cause to doubt his word. Hitherto his performances had kept pace with his promises. Besides, the gentlemen who advocate the proposed abolition seemed to forget that the grievance complained of was of the minutest character. For if the appeals for the last ten years were taken, it would be found that they did not average four a year. The new judicial system proposed would, in all probability, take place next year; and it was, therefore, just possible that four more cases might come on in the meantime.<sup>76</sup> If from this were taken the excepted cases in which the appeal would still be--the good to be done by the bill would be really very small. Practically speaking the appeal was merely nominal. They should not legislate in a hurry to repent afterwards. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would be quite ready to upset our whole system in five minutes, but these

matters should be approached with caution. The Attorney-General had been punctual in the fulfilment of his other promises, and they might wait till another session for a thorough reform. He was in favor of limiting appeals to our own Courts because they were more competent to judge according to our laws, but he thought it better to wait another year before taking it up, for the reason stated by the Attorney-General.<sup>77</sup>

MR. CAMERON said he differed in opinion with the last Speaker. The right of appeal is guaranteed under an Imperial Statute, and any person would have, under a clause of that Statute, the right of appeal, and this colony had no power to alter that Imperial Statute.<sup>78</sup> He agreed, however, with much that had been said during this discussion as to the propriety of having that appeal done away with, and he would say so in reference to Upper as well as Lower Canada. He thought our own judiciary was quite competent finally to decide all our cases.<sup>79</sup> He was of opinion that the time had arrived when we had a right (he spoke of Upper Canada) to have all these cases of appeal left in the hands of such men, who from their abilities and standing, were appointed to preside over the judicial tribunals of this Province, and who, from the extent of their legal knowledge and high standing at the Bar, and on their elevation to the Bench could be favorably compared with any other amongst our neighbors in the older States, or those of the Old Country.<sup>80</sup> (Hear, hear.) And often when Appeals had gone to England, the Judges in England had expressed themselves in the strongest terms in regard to the ability displayed by our Judges here. Seldom if ever indeed had a judgment affirmed in the Court of Appeal in this country been reversed in England<sup>81</sup>, as the Courts are now arranged, where the appeal is to the whole Bench. Not only was the appeal open from the Upper Courts to the Privy Council, but even from the inferior Courts: the words of the Statute being "any decision of any Court, &c., although such court shall not be a Court of Appeal or Court of Errors." Even in such cases, and where the Superior Courts had not been appealed to, Her Majesty's Privy Council had the full power of revoking the decision, or to make an order on any such count to non-suit all papers and evidence touching the case, with the reasons for rendering the judgment in question. So that under the Statute 7 and 8 Victoria, ch. 8 and 9, there is the power of appeal irrespective of our Courts of Law, and this was one of our colonial difficulties, and to which he had already directed the attention of the Government and the Province, in the notice which he had already before the House, and the information thereby sought had not as yet been furnished to the House.<sup>82</sup> This state of things ought not to exist. Last session they had passed an address against one of these grievances, an act intended, evidently, to apply only to Crown Colonies and plantations, governed by a Governor and Council, not enjoying a constitution and independent legislation, yet held strictly to extend to Canada; [it] also gave a creditor in England the right to go before a Mayor or other magistrate there, and make affidavit to a debt, and upon such affidavit, without giving the debtor resident in the Colony the opportunity to cross-examine and rebut his evidence, he was entitled to judgment.<sup>83</sup> In consequence of a case of this nature, an Address [was sent] to Her Majesty, thinking, and justly, that it was not right or just, that our privileges of trial and defence should be taken away merely upon such affidavit, without any opportunity of examination or adducing counter testimony. He (Mr. Cameron) had been anxiously awaiting a reply<sup>84</sup>. To that address an answer had been returned from the law officers of the Crown in England, that they did not see any just grounds of complaint. A copy of a judgment was forwarded them in one of their cases, in which the highest Court in Upper Canada, next to the Court of Appeal, had pointed out the hardship and injustice of such a system. In that case, fortunately, there were certain informalities in the procedure which prevented the

English creditor from getting judgment, and the court declared itself glad to seize this pretext to dismiss the action. He was in favour of abolishing the right of appeal--not even reserving the rights of the Crown, for the Crown never paid costs, and the enormous costs of such appeals would, in these cases, fall heavily upon even a successful suitor. It was not right that the power of our Judiciary should be thus interfered with.<sup>85</sup> In fact this law if removed from the statute book would leave all such questions where they ought to rest, in the hands of the judges of the Province, and surely if these judges were competent to render a judgment on 100L, 200L, or 400L, they were qualified to render one upon a question of 500L, and if so upon 501L, or any higher amount without the appeal in such cases going to the Queen in Council; and such should be the fact equally in cases affecting the Crown as the subject and he was of opinion that the sooner we got rid of that objectionable suit the better, and the House ought to be apprised why a satisfactory reply has not been furnished to the address on the subject already referred to, as there was a crying injustice in the case, and the sooner the Province got rid of the difficulty the better.<sup>86</sup>

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) was glad to have heard the hon. member for Toronto express himself so strongly on the propriety of our regulating these matters ourselves. In reference, however, to another portion of his remarks, he would say that there was a very important difference between an appeal under the Provincial Statute, and an appeal under the Imperial Statute. The latter did not delay the execution of judgment--the other did for a certain period.<sup>87</sup>

MR. CAMERON suggested an alteration in the bill, that instead of enacting positively and in violation of the Imperial Statute, that the decision should be final, and that no appeal should lie to the Privy Council, it should simply repeal the Provincial Statute. That was all the House could do.<sup>88</sup>

MR. A. DORION read from the Provincial Statute words of the same purport as those objected to by Mr. Cameron, viz:--"that no appeal should lie, but that the decision should be final in all cases under 500L."<sup>89</sup> The appeal under the Provincial statute was granted summarily by our own courts as a matter of right, that under the Imperial Statutes was only granted after an application to a party showing cause before the Privy Council, that appeal had always existed for cases under 500L in which the Provincial Statute deemed it, but so difficult was the process, that only one such appeal had been taken since the passing of the Provincial Statute, in the reign of George the III. To abolish the appeal under Provincial Statute, was to abolish it practically altogether. It might be well to address the Imperial authorities to repeal the Imperial Statutes interfering with the independent action of our judges.<sup>90</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--Everything which had been said only showed that much more time any deliberation should have been given to the Bill by the hon. gentleman who had introduced it. He would see that hon. gentlemen on both sides were desirous to give their assistance in carrying out any measure that was likely at all to meet the difficulties in the way. It might be as well for the hon. gentleman to wait until the government had introduced their measure, which they would endeavour to prepare with more care and caution, and which when introduced would be found somewhat more homogeneous with the present system, and not tending to break it up as he considered the Bill now before them would do.<sup>91</sup> He would put it to the hon. member and his friends, whether they would not postpone the bill in the meantime.<sup>92</sup>

No response being made to this appeal,<sup>93</sup>

(93)

The Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Cartier, That the word "now" be left out, and the words "this day six months" added at the end thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided; and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

YEAS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bell, Biggar, Cartier, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Cook, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Evanturel, Felton, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gill, Guévremont, Jackson, Labelle, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Macbeth, Attorney General Macdonald, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Matheson, Meagher, Joseph C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, O'Farrell, Polette, Poulin, Pouliot, Price, Robinson, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Solicitor General Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(52.)<sup>94</sup>

(94)

NAYS.

Messieurs Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Burton, Cameron, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Dufresne, Ferrie, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gamble, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Larwill, Lyon, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Marchildon, Masson, Mattice, Munro, Murney, Papin, Patrick, Powell, Prévost, Rolph, Sanborn, Scatcherd, Turcotte, Valois, Wright, and Young.--(44.)

So it was resolved in the Affirmative.

Then the Question being put on the main motion, as amended;

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time this day six months.<sup>95</sup>

Then, on motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Drummond, seconded by the Honorable Sir Allan N. MacNab,

The House adjourned.<sup>96</sup>

APPENDIX: 4 MARCH 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR A BILL RE: BUFFALO AND LAKE HURON RAILROAD COMPANY.]

MR. CRAWFORD introduced a Bill to incorporate the Brantford (sic) and Lake Huron Railroad Company.<sup>97</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that no notice of this Bill having been given, it could not now be read.<sup>98</sup>

The motion stood as a notice for to-morrow.<sup>99</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: FEES OF CLERKS OF THE PEACE IN UPPER CANADA.]

MR. A. MORRISON enquired of the Ministry, whether it was their intention during the present Session, to bring in a Bill to increase the tariff of fees of the Clerks of the Peace in Upper Canada?<sup>100</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said the matter was in the consideration of the Government; and he would only say that it was their desire to relieve Clerks of the Peace in Upper Canada from the position in which they now stand--their present emolument being entirely inadequate for their support.<sup>101</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: MUNICIPAL LAWS OF UPPER CANADA.]

MR. LUMSDEN enquired of the ministry, whether it is their intention, during the present session, to bring in a Bill to consolidate in one Act the different municipal laws now in force in Upper Canada?<sup>102</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD replied that the Government had appointed a commission for the purpose of revising the statutes. That commission was now at work, and the first thing they had undertaken was the revision and consolidation of the municipal acts of Upper Canada, and their report, he believed, would be ready to take action upon, before the close of the session.<sup>103</sup>

In reply to MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary),<sup>104</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said that the Commissioners had before them the labours of the Commissioners of last session; but their duty was only to revise and consolidate, and it would be for the House to say in what respect the Bill, so revised and consolidated, should be amended.<sup>105</sup>

MR. HARTMAN.--Are we to understand that the government are to take up and pass an act consolidating the whole of the municipal laws into one, and making such amendments as may be considered necessary?<sup>106</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--I said that the Commissioners are revising and consolidating all the acts affecting the municipalities in Upper Canada, that they will report a bill, and that the government will take up that bill and carry it through with such amendments as may be considered necessary.<sup>107</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary).--Will it be reported in time to take action on it this session?<sup>108</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD.--I am informed so by the Commissioners.<sup>109</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION RE: PRINTING OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.]

MR. THIBAudeau moved; that the clerk of the House do order a sufficient number of the votes and proceeding to allow each member to have 30 copies.<sup>110</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said that as they had adopted a rule yesterday in relation to the printing of the House it would be better that this motion would be referred to that committee.<sup>111</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said that the motion did not come within the province of that committee.<sup>112</sup>

After some brief remarks ... [MR. THIBAudeau] withdrew the motion.<sup>113</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CHARGES AGAINST DR. MCCAUL.]

MR. HARTMAN stated that the Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the charges brought against Dr. McCaul, having been published in the papers this morning, he would allow his notice on the subject to drop<sup>114</sup> as the information which he desired to have, had ... been given to the public in another way. [He] ... deemed it unnecessary to ask another copy of it to be sent down to this House.<sup>115</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. J.A. MACDONALD said there was still the evidence which had been taken, copies of which might be had if desired.<sup>116</sup>

MR. HARTMAN said he did not want any further information on this point at present.<sup>117</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A BILL RE: PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCE.]

On the question for the introduction of a Bill to establish an efficient Police Force in this Province,<sup>118</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB said he was anxious to have introduced the Bill to-day, and had come to the House for that purpose; but some alterations having been made in the Bill in order to make it as complete as possible, they had not yet been printed off. He would, however, introduce it pro forma to-morrow, and would explain the Bill then.<sup>119</sup>

FOOTNOTES: 4 MARCH 1856.

1. LE PAYS, 18 March 1856.
2. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
3. GLOBE, 5 March 1856. Commenting on Mr. MacNab's state of health, TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856, points out that "Sir Allan MacNab was in his place, but seemed somewhat languid, and not to have recovered his usual spirits."
4. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
5. IBID.
6. IBID.
7. IBID.
8. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856. In a commentary, GLOBE, 5 March 1856, reports the following information: "On Mr. Dorion asking for some information in regard to ... [the Bill], a good deal of whispering was witnessed on the Treasury Benches--and all that could be got from the Attorney General were some vague generalities as to the institutions that might be incorporated under the law."
9. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
10. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
11. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
12. GLOBE, 5 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, imputes this question to Mr. J.S. Macdonald, but TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856, concurs with the Globe.
13. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
14. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
15. GLOBE, 5 March 1856. In a commentary, this newspaper adds the following information: "In moving the first reading of his Bill, Mr. Drummond presented to the Clerk a printed copy, but it was afterwards withdrawn and a blank sheet of paper substituted; so that the details of the measure could not be learned."
16. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
17. IBID.
18. IBID.
19. IBID.
20. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
21. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
22. GLOBE, 5 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, reports Mr. Cayley "made some explanations that were not distinctly audible with regard to the first matter requiring amendment."
23. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
24. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
25. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
26. IBID.
27. IBID.
28. IBID.
29. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
30. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
31. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
32. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
33. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
34. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
35. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
36. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
37. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.

38. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
39. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 18 March 1856, provides the following commentary on this Bill: "Dr. Poulin also appears in the capacity of legislator, with a bill to provide for the establishment of a Superior Primary or Model School in each School Municipality, the provisions of this bill being very sensible. He imposes the establishment of such School as a duty on the Commissioners of each such Municipality having a population of 3000 under a penalty, and provides that the teacher of the girl's department shall receive a salary of at least 60L, and of the male of from 75L to 100L per annum. This bill will, no doubt, be merged in the general measure to be brought in by the Provincial Secretary, but in the meantime Dr. Poulin deserves credit for this manifestation of zeal in favor of education."
40. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
41. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
42. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
43. IBID.
44. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856. According to TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856, and GLOBE, 5 March 1856, Mr. Drummond replied to Mr. Daoust in French.
45. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
46. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856. According to GLOBE, 5 March 1856, Mr. Loranger spoke in French.
47. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
48. IBID.
49. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
50. IBID.
51. IBID.
52. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
53. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
54. IBID.
55. IBID.
56. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
57. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
58. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
59. IBID.
60. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
61. IBID.
62. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
63. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
64. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
65. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
66. IBID.
67. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
68. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
69. IBID.
70. MORNING CHRONICLE, 8 March 1856.
71. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
72. MORNING CHRONICLE, 8 March 1856.
73. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
74. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
75. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
76. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
77. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.

78. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
79. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
80. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
81. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
82. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856, differs from this newspaper and reports Mr. Cameron "referred especially to the Acts 7 and 8 Vict. cap. 30, and 7 and 8 Vict. cap. 69".
83. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
84. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
85. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
86. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
87. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
88. IBID.
89. IBID.
90. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 6 March 1856.
91. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
92. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
93. IBID.
94. GLOBE, 5 March 1856, differs from the JOURNALS when it omits Mr. C. Fortier's name and reports Mr. Niles' instead.
95. LE PAYS, 11 March 1856, reports the following commentary on the vote: "Ce vote est une preuve que la grande majorité du ministère se rapetisse singulièrement quelque fois et pourrait bien, quelque bon jour, se réduire à zéro. C'est ici que l'on peut voir dans quel parti il existe plus d'harmonie, et que le public peut juger la valeur des accusations que le ministère et ses amis ont portée[s] contre l'opposition, durant les débats sur l'adresse, lorsqu'ils disaient que les membres qui composent l'opposition ne pouvaient s'entendre sur aucune mesure. La première question importante qui est soumise à la chambre montre que l'opposition est unanime, tandis qu'il y a une division sérieuse dans les rangs du ministère, qui se trouve tout à coup avec une simple majorité de huit sur un amendement proposé par le procureur-général lui-même. Il y a dans ce vote un autre fait que les électeurs du Bas-Canada devront remarquer; le bill de M. Daoust, tel que proposé, ne s'appliquait qu'au Bas-Canada, tout le monde reconnaissait que le principe en était bon; néanmoins c'est par une majorité des membres Bas-Canadiens qu'il a été perdu. Voici comment les membres des deux sections de la province se sont divisés; Parmi les membres du Haut-Canada 24 ont voté pour le bill, et 23 contre; parmi les membres du Bas-Canada, 20 ont voté pour et 29 contre." Le Pays then lists the names of the 29 Lower Canadian members who voted for Mr. Drummond's amendment, throwing out the Bill.  
WESTERN PLANET, 13 March 1856, explains the result of the vote by stating that the "cause of this comparatively small majority was no doubt the parading of the Cameron brigade for the first time in opposition to the ministry. But in addition to that there were several Lower Canadian votes, usually found with the ministry, but who on this occasion were in the opposition."
96. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856, reports: "No other measure being ready to go on with, the House adjourned about 20 minutes to 6 o'clock." GLOBE, 5 March 1856, reports the following comment: "Last evening was Government night--and yet the House rose before six o'clock; nay, had it not been for a Bill presented by a member of the Opposition on which discussion arose, the business would all have been gone through by four o'clock! The public will learn from this the amount of honesty there was in the charge of the Ministerial organs that the Opposition retarded the public business. Parliament is now in its fourth week,

and yet the Ministry have introduced but three Bills and these have only been introduced pro forma--have not been printed--have not even been explained to the House."

97. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
98. IBID.
99. IBID.
100. IBID.
101. IBID.
102. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
103. IBID.
104. IBID.
105. IBID.
106. IBID.
107. IBID.
108. IBID.
109. IBID.
110. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
111. IBID.
112. IBID.
113. IBID.
114. GLOBE, 5 March 1856.
115. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
116. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856. GLOBE, 5 March 1856, reports Mr. J.A. Macdonald "made some observations, which were inaudible in the gallery."
117. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 5 March 1856.
118. IBID.
119. IBID.

WEDNESDAY, 5 MARCH 1856.

(94)

THE following Petitions were severally brought up, and laid on the table:--

By Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion,--The Petition of the Governors of the University of McGill College.

By Mr. Somerville,--The Petition of Alexander Cameron, of the Parish of St. Anicet.

By Mr. Frazer,--The Petition of R.H. Thornhill and others, of the Township of Bertie, County of Welland; the Petition of Peter Gibbons and others, Merchants and others, of the Village of Port Colborne; and the Petition of James C. Woodruff and others, of the Township of Niagara, County of Lincoln.

By Mr. Southwick,--Two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Elgin; and the Petition of Joseph Walker and others, Reeves of Brant and other Townships, County of Bruce.

By Mr. Conger,--The Petition of Thomas White and others, of the County of Peterborough; and the Petition of Thomas Choate and others, of the Townships of Dummer and Douro, County of Peterborough.

By Mr. Evanturel,--The Petition of John Dohoney, of the Parish of Valcartier, County of Quebec; and the Petition of the Reverend P. Huot and others, of the Parish of Ste. Foye.

By Mr. Felton,--The Petition of J.F. Taylor and others, Trustees of the High School in the Township of Eaton.

By Mr. McCann,--The Petition of Peter McLaurin and others, of the Township of South Plantagenet, County of Prescott.

By Mr. Cooke,--The Petition of the Municipality of Hull, County of Ottawa; and the Petition of the Municipality of Ste. Angélique, County of Ottawa.

By Mr. Brown,--The Petition of R.V. Rogers, Chairman of the Sabbath Reformation Society of Kingston, and others; the Petition of William Mackenzie and others, of the Township of Warwick, County of Lambton; the Petition of Thomas Webb and others; the Petition of John Scott and others, of the Village of Galt, County of Waterloo; two Petitions of the Municipal Council of the County of Lambton; the Petition of

(95)

W.P. Vidal and others, of the Town of Port Sarnia, County of Lambton; the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Dawn; and the Petition of William Boylan and others, of the Township of Dawn.

By Mr. Niles,--The Petition of Hamilton Dunlop and others, of the Township of London, County of Middlesex.

By Mr. Patrick,--The Petition of Mrs. Mary Crane and others, of the Township of Augusta, County of Grenville.

By the Honorable Mr. Cameron,--The Petition of the Woodstock, Lake Erie Railway and Harbor Company; and the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Minto, County of Wellington.

By Mr. Masson,--The Petition of Alfred Center and others, of the County of Argenteuil.

By Mr. Aikins,--The Petition of D.A. Hanse and others, of the Village of Churchville, County of York and Peel.

Pursuant to the Order of the day, the following Petitions were read:--

Of Antoine Charles Taschereau; praying that a pension may be granted him for his long services as a Public Officer.

Of the Very Reverend E. Crévier, Founder of the Academy for Girls, of the Parish of Rouville; praying for aid.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kent; praying that the fees allowed to medical men summoned as witnesses before Coroners' inquests, be paid out of the funds appropriated for the Administration of Justice, and not out of the funds of the County.

Of Thomas Jackson and others, of the South-western portion of the County of Kent; praying that a Harbour may be made of the "Two Creeks" in the Township of Romney, on Lake Erie.

Of H. McCrea and others, of the Township of Wolford, County of Grenville; Of James Beattie and others, of the Township of Westminster, County of Middlesex; Of D.B. Stickney and others, of the Township of Camden East; Of Job Aylsworth and others, of the Township of Camden, County of Addington; Of John Beatty and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of Mrs. Mary Woods and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of Wm. Hargraft and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of Mrs. George Stevens and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of John Field and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of R.C. Wilkins and others, of the Township of Murray, County of Northumberland; Of John Holman and others, of the Town of Cobourg; Of Andrew Nicol and others, of the Town of Clinton, County of Huron; Of George R. Bruner and others, of the Township of Gosfield, County of Essex; Of William Symington and others, of the Township of Colborne, County of Huron; Of Solomon Jones and others, of the Township of Pembroke, County of Renfrew; Of John Snyder and others, of the Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel; Of Joseph Roadhouse and others, of the Township of Albion, County of Peel; Of Henry Pearson and others, of the Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel; Of Alexander Campbell and others, of the Townships of Cheltenham and Chinguacousy, County of Peel; Of the Reverend J. Fishburn and others, of the Township of Markham, County of York; Of Alexander Muir and others, of the Township of Scarborough, County of York; Of Mrs. Jannett Allan and others, of the Town of Perth and vicinity; Of William Allan and others, of the Town of Perth and vicinity; Of Mrs. Anne McHugh and others, of the Township of Manvers; Of W.W. Dannell and others, of Ops, and other Townships, County of Victoria; Of Mrs. Mary Lawrence and others, of the Township of Pilkington, County of Wellington; Of Robert Henderson and others, of the Town of Elora, County of Wellington; Of Stephen King and others, of the Township of Barton,

(96)

County of Wentworth; Of Mrs. Catherine Smith and others, of the Township of Barton, County of Wentworth; Of Thomas G. Anderson and others, of the Township of Nepean, County of Carleton; Of George Bell and others, of the Township of Nepean, County of Carleton; Of Alexander Kennedy and others, of the Township of Esquesing, County of Halton; Of James Cunningham and others, of the Township of Charlottenburgh, County of Glengarry; Of John Atkinson and others, of the Township of Biddulph, County of Huron; Of Jacob Shoults and others, of the Township of McGillivray, County of Huron; praying for the passing of a Prohibitory Liquor Law.

Of Hiram McCrea and others, of the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, setting forth; that David Langdon, of the Township of Elizabethtown, did, while in the discharge of his duty as a Constable, on the 13th February, 1844, receive certain wounds and injuries; and praying relief for the said David Langdon.

Of David Ballingal and others, of the Township of South Dumfries, County of Brant; praying that the road allowance between lots numbers thirty and thirty-one, in the second concession of the Township of South Dumfries, County of Brant, may not be vested in Horace Capron and Myron Ames.

Of the Medical Faculty of McGill College; praying for aid.

Of John Young and others, merchants, tradesmen, and others, of the City of Hamilton; praying for an Act of Incorporation under the name of the North-western Railway Company.

Of L.G. Nolin and others, of the Parish of L'Assomption; Of C. Corteau and others, of the County of L'Assomption; Of Ludger LeBlanc and others, of the Parish of St. Lignori, County of Montcalm; praying for certain amendments to the Act incorporating the L'Assomption River and Railway Company.

Of Sarah Odell, of the Village of Huntingdon, Widow of the late William Bowron; praying relief for loss of property sustained during the last war between the United States of America and Great Britain.

Of Donald Livingston, of the Parish of St. Anicet; praying compensation for damage done to his property, caused by the dam erected by the Board of Works, at the head of the Beauharnois Canal.

Of Caleb Mallery and others, of the Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland; praying for the passing of an Act confirming the patent granted to him of lot Number four, broken concession A, and lot Number four, broken concession B, in the Township of Hamilton.

Of John Collins and others, Members of the Committee of the Montreal Eye and Ear Institution; praying for aid.

Of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the City of Toronto; praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the construction of a Railroad from the waters of Lake Huron at Saugeen, to the waters of Ontario at Toronto.

Of John Thompson and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland; praying for the passing of an Act to enable the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company to extend their line of Railway from Thorold to Port Colborne, on Lake Erie.

Of Lewis Clement, of the Village of Thorold, County of Welland; praying for arrears of Pension due him for services rendered during the last war with the United States of America.

Of C. Knowlson and others, of the Village of Metcalfe, County of Victoria; praying for the passing of an Act to authorize William Cottingham to raise his dam, on Pigeon Creek, to such a height as will not interfere with any other privilege.

Of William Best and others, of the Township of Ops; Of Alexander Feir and others, of the Township of Ops; praying that no power or authority may be given to raise the height of the dam on Pigeon Creek.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Nepean; Of the Municipality of the

(97)

Township of Goulburn; praying that a survey be made in order to ascertain the probable cost of opening a continuous line of water communication from Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence, by the Valley of the Ottawa.

Of the Municipality of the Township of Goulburn; Of the Municipality of the Township of Nepean; praying that measures may be adopted as will relieve from a heavy personal tax, the rural population of the County of Carleton.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kamouraska; praying for aid to continue the road through the Township of Woodbridge.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kamouraska; praying for the passing of an Act to prohibit the sale and the cutting of timber on the waste lands of the Crown in the County of Kamouraska.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Chicoutimi; praying aid for the construction of certain roads and bridges along the North Shore of the River St. Lawrence to Grand Baie.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kamouraska; praying that means may be adopted for the payment of the debts due by the late Municipal Council of the District of Kamouraska.

Of the Municipal Council of the County of Kamouraska; praying for certain amendments to the Municipal and Road Act of 1855.

Of the City Bank; praying for certain amendments to the several Acts incorporating the said Bank.

Of the Reverend L.D. Charland, Curé of the Parish of St. Clement, and others, of the County of Beauharnois; praying aid for the Academy in the said Parish.

Of the Reverend L.D. Charland, Curé of the Parish of St. Clement, and others, of the County of Beauharnois; praying aid for a College in the said County.

Of the Commercial Bank, Midland District; praying for the consolidation and amendment of their Act of Incorporation.

Of the Canadian Order of Odd Fellows in connection with the Manchester Unity; praying for an Act of Incorporation.

Of the Reverend J.M. Lemonges and others, of the Borough of William Henry; praying aid in support of the school under the care of the Sisters of Providence, in the said Borough.

Of D.J. Hughes and others, of the County of Elgin; praying for an Act of Incorporation for Banking purposes, under the name of "The Bank of the County of Elgin."

Of G.N. Cleveland and others, of the Township of Shipton, District of St. Francis, praying aid for the Academy in the Village of Danville.

Of Mathieu Fournier, of the Parish of Ste. Rosalie, and P.G.H. Roy, of the Parish of St. Hyacinthe; praying for arrears of pension due them for services during the war of 1812.

Of the Committee of the British and Canadian School Society of Montreal; praying for aid.

Of D. Myrand and others, electors of the City of Quebec; praying for the passing of an Act to render the Mayor elective for the said City.

Ordered, That the Petition of the Municipality of the Township of Wainfleet; the Petition of Peter Gibbons and others, Creditors of the Buffalo, Brantford and Goderich Railway Company; the Petition of the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company; the Petition of T.N. Ball and others, of the Township of Thorold, County of Welland; the Petition of Thomas Parke, of Port Colborne; the Petition of J.P. Boomer and others, of Queenston and St. Catharines; the Petition of Thomas Scholfield and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland; the Petition of W. Mellanby and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland; and the Petition of John Thompson

(98)

and others, of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland, be referred to the Standing Committee on Railroads, Canals, and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. Stevenson, from the Standing Committee on Printing, presented to the House, the First Report of the said Committee, which was read, as followeth:--

With reference to the motion of yesterday for the printing of the Return relative to the withdrawal from sale of certain lands in the Counties of Grey and Bruce; and the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs; Your Committee have carefully examined the several documents composing the said Return, and recommend that the following be not printed, viz:--

1. Letter from Lord Bury, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, to Charles Rankin, Esquire, Provincial Land Surveyor, dated the 26th April, 1855, conveying instructions for the survey of a portion of the Indian Reservation, Northwest of Owen Sound.

2. Instructions referred to in the above letter.

3. Letter from Mr. Rankin to Lord Bury, transmitting plan of Town plot at the mouth of the Saugeen, (Indian side) and giving topographical details as to Site, Lots, etc.

4. Letter from Lord Bury to W.R. Bartlett, Esquire, dated the 12th September, 1855, conveying intimation of his appointment as Agent for the sale of the Saugeen Lands, to commence his duties on the 1st October next. Also, copy of instructions as to sale, payments, instalments, &c.

5. Letter from Mr. Rankin to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, acknowledging receipt of 150L, on account of surveys, and promising to forward plans as soon as they can be got ready. And,

6. Letter from S.Y. Chesley, Esquire, to Mr. Rankin, dated the 7th November, 1855, calling his attention to an article in the "Colonist," signed, "One of the Surveyors of the Tract," and requesting him to state whether or not he is the writer.

The estimated cost for the Printing of which is Eleven pounds.

Your Committee recommend that the number of copies to be printed of this Return be One thousand. The estimated cost of which is Twenty-three pounds.

Resolved, That this House doth concur with the Committee in the said Report.

Ordered, That the Petition of Sarah Odell, of the Village of Huntingdon, widow of the late William Bowron, be printed for the use of the Members of this House.

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said, that seeing the Hon'ble Crown Lands Commissioner in his place, he would submit the motion of which he had given notice. He would therefore move for an Address to His Excellency for copies of any Orders in Council, and for any notice or orders signed by the Commissioner of Crown Lands since the first day of January, 1855, having reference to any change in the system which formerly permitted the public to have direct access to books, maps, and papers connected with the Crown Timber Land Department. That motion stated succinctly the object he had in view, which was simply to ascertain whether there had been any orders in Council authorizing changes to be made in the Crown Lands Department, setting aside that system which formerly prevailed in Upper Canada, and which, so far as intercourse with the officers of the Department was concerned, seemed to have given general satisfaction.<sup>1</sup> It was with astonishment therefore that individuals, members of the House and others, who had been in the habit of visiting the department, now found it closed against them, and that access to documents could only be had on special application to the Crown Lands Commissioner.<sup>2</sup> Of course he (Mr. McDonald) took it for granted, that a change so important as this, a change which excluded the people of Upper Canada, would not be made without the consent of his colleagues. The people of Upper Canada are more acquainted with the business of the Crown Lands department than the people in Lower, and they consequently feel aggrieved at being shut out of these offices. It would be in the recollection of some hon. gentleman that this same system was adopted on a former occasion, and alleged to be abandoned by a predecessor of the hon. Commissioner. The hon. Mr. Papineau adopted the same course in Montreal, and he found that the system of shutting up the Crown Lands Department from public view was not satisfactory, and he was obliged to abandon it. It was hoped therefore that the same step would not be again taken in Upper Canada, unless there were good reasons for such a step. He hoped therefore to hear these reasons to-day, and if they were such as to show that the public business will be as well attended to, then his object would be attained.<sup>3</sup> He feared, however, that no very satisfactory explanations could be given, as he knew both from the conversation of hon. members, and the opinion expressed outside, that there had been a great

amount of dissatisfaction created by the change. Formerly, individuals in quest of information communicated directly with the clerks in charge of the several departments, and if clerks were not considered capable of giving ordinary information without the interposition of the Commissioner, he was of opinion that those clerks should not be continued.<sup>4</sup> A dozen men might have gone in at once, one going to the Surveyor General's department, a second to the Crown Timber, and a third to another, and got the information they wanted, and would have departed satisfied. Now the system was such as to prevent it.<sup>5</sup> Supposing a person now went to the department for information, whether connected with the Crown Lands, the Clergy Reserves, or the Surveyor General's department, a clerk gave him a paper and pencil and told him to write down what he wanted. Perhaps there were a dozen other gentlemen in the anti-room. The clerk takes off your paper to the Clergy Reserve department, while another gentleman is waiting, anxious to see some field notes in the Surveyor General's department. He sits quietly till the clerk returns from the Clergy Reserve department, and when he comes back, perhaps you want more information, and off he goes again, and a dozen individuals have to sit there waiting the movements of that one clerk. Whereas under the old system, individuals went to the respective departments, and procured at once and without difficulty, the information they were in quest of.<sup>6</sup> He supposed this had been adopted after a report to the Council, but he defied<sup>7</sup> the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands to show him on this continent, at Washington, or in any of the land offices in the various States, any such department where admission was not freely given to every individual who had occasion to go to it.--Such being the case, he asked whether the new system was calculated to give satisfaction, especially when there was a large accumulation of business on hand created by the impossibility of the hon. Commissioner carrying on the routine business of the office during the sitting of Parliament, by the removal to Toronto which followed, and by the Commissioner's subsequent absence in Europe.<sup>8</sup> All at once after the return of the Commissioner from Europe, the Commissioner had set to work to make these new reforms. He had no complaint to make personally. He had happened to get the information he wanted, but<sup>9</sup> hon. members of this House were very much inconvenienced by the new arrangements. They were called upon to attend gratuitously to a large amount of business entrusted to them by their constituents, and there were only certain days on which they had leisure to attend to those duties. They went, and perhaps were attended to--perhaps, if the Commissioner was absent or indisposed, they had to wait till next day. But the poor man coming from the country, who could neither read nor write, was in a much worse condition. When he entered the office, he was perplexed.<sup>10</sup> Formerly a poor man could go in and explain to any of the clerks in his own way the kind of information he wanted, and he got it and went away satisfied. Many a time such a man did not know exactly what he wanted, and it was only by the questions of the clerk to whom he applied for information that he was enabled to transact his little business with that Department.<sup>11</sup> [Now] he was met at the door by a messenger who told him "write down what you want." This he could not do, and it was with the utmost difficulty that he could explain his wants through the messenger, and the result was that he was kept hanging on day after day, seeking perhaps his patent for Clergy Reserve lands on which he had paid his instalments, and on the issue of which depended the prosperity of himself and his family. Every man who was in the habit of visiting the Crown Lands Department, would bear him out in saying that, under the system which existed before, a man would obtain in ten minutes more information than under the new system in three or four days. (Hear, hear.) And the system was not calculated to serve the interests of every member of the community alike.<sup>12</sup> [It was] giving him or any member of the House an opportunity of finding ready access to that Department, while

the poor man was virtually shut out.<sup>13</sup> He (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) had no more right to be treated civilly than the poor man who came from a distant neighbourhood. The first thing that had called his attention to the new regulations was a notice in one of the papers, dated 26th January, to the effect, that the Commissioner of Crown Lands gave notice that strangers were strictly prohibited from frequenting the department in office hours, and that no information would be given except on written application to him, or by authority. But how could the Commissioner be found, when so large a portion of his time was occupied with sitting in Council, and attending to his legislative duties. If you went to-day, and sent in your written application for permission to see documents, a personal inspection of which may be necessary to satisfy you--you cannot get an answer instantly on account of the absence of the Commissioner, attending to his duties as adviser of the Crown, or member of this house. And you may go the next day with the like result.<sup>14</sup> There was an immense accumulation of business which the regulation increased. With this regulation the arrears could never be worked off. Of course, the whole government was responsible for the management of this department, as it was to be supposed, of course, as he had already stated, that this innovation had not been made without<sup>15</sup> the sanction and concurrence of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, and it was with the view to obtaining the report on which it had been introduced that he had made the motion now before the chair. He knew the hon. gentleman was possessed of a large amount of determination and pluck, but he scarcely thought that he would have placed himself in violent collision with public feeling, unless his course were sustained by his colleagues<sup>16</sup>, and if so, there will be report setting forth that it was impossible to carry on the business of the Department under the old system.<sup>17</sup> But the charges he had spoken of were not all. The Commissioner of Crown Lands not only closed the doors of his department against the public, but, he was told, had made sweeping changes in the department itself. That for instance clerks who had wrought in the same room for years and lent valuable mutual aid to each other, had been causelessly separated. He could say for those clerks that they were on all occasions polite to visitors, and had faithfully discharged their duties. And, although he had conceived that Mr. Spragge had some crotchets, and had shown himself too exacting in certain respects, he believed nearly all who knew him would admit that a more diligent and laborious officer was not to be found in any office in Upper Canada. He was of opinion that the fidelity and attention of Mr. Spragge had saved millions of acres of land to the country. But as if to destroy that gentleman's efficiency, and the efficiency of the staff who surrounded him, the Commissioner had conceived it necessary to break up that combination and to distribute the clerks into different offices.<sup>18</sup> Mr. Spragge ... had had the whole branch over which he presided remodelled, and men given business to do with which they were unacquainted. The Commissioner might say that he was responsible for the working of the department, and did this to promote its efficiency. He liked such boldness, but he did not think the Commissioner could shew any good reasons for these changes. A reason had indeed been hinted at, but he did not care to refer to it.<sup>19</sup> Mr. Jones was an able and efficient clerk, who had been in the same office as Mr. Spragge, [and] prepared prescriptions for the patents. And when Mr. Roche who wrote them out from those prescriptions, required information on any point, it was convenient that he should be at the same desk as Mr. Jones. But they had been separated. Mr. Roche had been sent away into another department, of the business of which he knew nothing, and Mr. Jones was sent away into the Lower Canada branch. Would any one say that that was giving Mr. Spragge efficient aid in carrying on the business of the people of Upper Canada?<sup>20</sup> The Commissioner might have talent enough, but he had not the experience others had in the land granting department. He had not the experience, or

the knowledge of the business of the department, which some of the clerks had.<sup>21</sup> There was another point in the procedure of Mr. Cauchon in regard to Mr. Spragge, which appeared in the report of the Crown Lands Committee, and was somewhat remarkable.<sup>22</sup> [That] Committee last year ... asked information from the clerks. They felt they had a right to demand this, quite irrespective of the head of the department. Mr. Spragge was specially asked to report to the Committee, and out of deference he mentioned the fact to his Chief. The Commissioner exacted from him that he should allow him to look over his report before sending it in.<sup>23</sup>

[Cries of] Hear, hear.<sup>24</sup>

[MR. J.S. MACDONALD:] Honorable gentlemen might cry--hear, hear; but he did not like Government employees to be thus overawed. They ought to be permitted to send in a report when specially asked to do so by any committee of this House<sup>25</sup>, and ... [be protected] from the censure of the head of the department if they reported faithfully, even though their views did not coincide with his.<sup>26</sup> Mr. Spragge sent in an able report, but accompanying it were certain remarks by Mr. Cauchon, "calling attention to discrepancies and errors in Mr. Spragge's statement." He thought this rather a strange course of procedure on the part of the Commissioner. Mr. Spragge had stated that the returns for sales in Lower Canada for 1854 were 9,000L, and the expense 4,700L; while the sales in Upper Canada were 174,000L, and the expense less than in Lower Canada. The Commissioner of Crown Lands wished to do away with the effect of that statement, and therefore took it upon himself to point out what he called the discrepancies and errors in it<sup>27</sup>, but Mr. S, in a rejoinder, had triumphantly refuted his arguments.<sup>28</sup> This was very bad in the Commissioner, thus to treat the report of an officer who had been for 25 years in that Department, and might have been expected to know every thing connected with it, while he, himself, had only been there a few months. The hon. gentleman went on at some length to show that the changes which had taken place were not calculated to facilitate the business of the country.<sup>29</sup> To illustrate further the new system of management, the hon. member proceeded to read from a newspaper an account of a visit paid by a member of Parliament to the Department, with a view to seeing the Crown Lands Commissioner. It stated that he was refused admittance by the messenger, but that after some altercation he forced his way through, vi et armis, into Mr. Cauchon's sanctum, and found him--not at his devotions--not writing editorials in defence of the Pope--not examining Crown land documents--but in his shirt-sleeves and slippers, eating fish and onions. (Laughter.)<sup>30</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB.--I call the hon. member to order. The hon. gentleman is reading from a Cornwall paper an article probably written by himself. I say it does not affect this question whether Mr. Cauchon eats fish or whether he eats onions. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman brings a serious charge against Mr. Cauchon, and he should have brought it in a serious way.<sup>31</sup> He had no right to read newspapers to the house.<sup>32</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER said, such had been the rule, but the practice had been so much indulged in with the sanction of the house, that he found a difficulty in enforcing it. The hon. member of course took the responsibility of what he stated as his own.<sup>33</sup>

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB.--I do not see how the circumstance of any gentleman happening to find Mr. Cauchon eating fish or onions or anything else has anything to

do with the question as to the mode in which he conducts the Crown Lands Department.<sup>34</sup> If he ate fish in lent, it ... was because he believed in the same faith as the member for Glengary.<sup>35</sup> The extract was evidently read for the purpose of exciting feelings, which should not be done in this country.<sup>36</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--I regret that I am unable to agree with the hon. and gallant member for Hamilton, when he says the hon. member for Glengary is not entitled to use that argument. Perhaps he may use the circumstance of the Commissioner's eating fish and onions as an argument to show his unfitness for the office he holds. But of course the hon. gentleman himself is responsible for the soundness of the argument.<sup>37</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD (Glengary) said he had treated the question as a serious one, and the House should have maintained its gravity while he did so. (Laughter.) Was it not a serious charge that the hon. gentleman had turned the Crown Lands Office into an eating-house? And this charge was brought, not in a paper published at Cornwall, but in one which had sometimes helped the Government in its difficulties, the London Free Press, an ably conducted paper.<sup>38</sup> [He] read this to give an opportunity to the hon. member to contradict it, if untrue. The calling to order on this point came with bad grace from the hon. and gallant knight. Had not columns of newspapers been read on that side of the House ... [to] convict his hon. friend, the member for Lambton, of inconsistency. Ridicule sometimes succeeded in awakening people, where sober argument failed.<sup>39</sup> Mr. Macdonald went on to say that it was no[t] in the nature of things that, under the present system, the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands should be cognizant of one-twentieth part of the business that passed through his department. Every enquiry made in the office, was, as he before stated, entered in a book. And for what purpose? In order that the hon. gentleman might know every single enquiry made in that office, from one year's end to the other. Now, he would like to know where was the necessity for becoming so intimately acquainted with every enquiry made there from one year's end to the other? Was such a course pursued in the Receiver General's office? He would assert there was not--nor yet in any other Government office.<sup>40</sup> It was impossible that the commissioner, if he were twice as clever as he was, could get through all the business of the department now ordered to be transacted through him.<sup>41</sup> He had felt it his duty to bring this matter before the House; and if the hon. the Commissioner for Crown Lands could satisfy the House that the system he had introduced was calculated to further the interests of the people, then his (Mr. McD's) task was done. But feeling that the operation of that system, as now pursued, was prejudicial to the interests of the Province, he would move the motion which he had just read.<sup>42</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON, in reply, expressed himself perfectly willing to answer any questions relative to the working of his department; but had no wish to follow the rumbling address of the member for Glengarry in which he treated not only of alleged evils in the Crown Land Department but attacked everything whether it had relation to the system pursued in his (Mr. C's) department or not. The course pursued by the hon. member for Glengarry, was taken simply for the sake of getting up a debate<sup>43</sup> before the House as to the mode in which the Commissioner of this Department should act<sup>44</sup>--scarcely any of the topics he touched on being included in his motion.<sup>45</sup> And when there was no complaint before the House, and when the question whether he (Mr. Cauchon) had done justice or not to the clerks, was not before it, he really did think he should be permitted to go into explanations as to the position in which he, as the chief officer of that department, stood.<sup>46</sup> The

member for Glengarry said he admired his (Mr. C.'s) pluck, in having a plan, and adhering to that plan, notwithstanding all the opposition thrown in his way. At the same time, however, that hon. gentleman denounced the system; but since that system had been established, he (Mr. C.) defied any hon. gentleman in that house, or any gentleman out of it, to prove that that system had not worked well. He defied any person, be he rich or poor, to come forward and prove that they had been prevented access to the books and papers of the department which they required. If any man could show that he had been refused access to such books or papers, in any one single instance--or that he (Mr. C.) had not been always able to supply parties with any information required, in the same time, or less, than it had ever been received under the old system,--then he would submit to the condemnation of the House. His system had been designated by the hon. member for Glengarry, not only as inefficient, but as causing a great loss of time. In reply to this accusation, he would merely state that,<sup>47</sup> he had been sick for eight days and had not been able to consider the matter, but he had taken notes not only of the answers given verbally but in writing since, and in not more than a fortnight four hundred and fourteen answers had been given since the 14th of February alone to applications (Hear, hear)<sup>48</sup>--many of which were of the most complicated description (sic). Where, he would like to know, was the waste of time in that instance? and it was but the type of many. Indeed, so large a number of persons apply at the office, that in one day he had seen as many as sixty-three applicants there. Notwithstanding this large number, he would assert that not one person ever left the office without being attended to, except [if] he was in a very violent hurry. Of course out of the forty or fifty persons who came to Mr. Spragg[e]'s office, or to Mr. Tarbut's office, most of them would wish to get access at once to those gentlemen, or to the head of the department. But would they receive the information they sought for, any quicker by such a course? Not at all.<sup>49</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>50</sup> On the contrary, such a course would be calculated to impede the transaction of business. It very often occurred that the cases sent in, were of such a complicated nature, as to require the personal attention of the head of the department; and to the consideration of such cases he invariably devoted a large portion of his time and attention. Cases of a more simple nature were entrusted to Mr. Kirkwood--a gentleman whose abilities were fully equal to the task, and who had been accustomed to the business, by being forced to do it.<sup>51</sup> He knew where to go for anything wanted, and did not roam about, stopping clerks to tell him.<sup>52</sup> Such was the real state of the case. He would now wish to state the reasons which led him to make this change. About nine o'clock one morning he went into Mr. Spragge's office, where he saw a general agent transacting business with the clerks. That person kept three of those clerks attending on him from nine in the morning until four in the afternoon!<sup>53</sup> [OR] until nine at night. (Hear, hear.)<sup>54</sup> That was the way in which the business was transacted before he changed the system--and it was the constant repetition of such cases, that induced him to make that change. That fact would sufficiently explain why persons living at a distance and writing to the Crown Lands Department to have their affairs adjusted, had often after a lapse of ten or twelve months complained of not receiving an answer. Under the old system it was well-nigh impossible for them to receive an answer in that time--if, indeed, they ever received it at all<sup>55</sup>, because the heads of the department who are the only men capable of dealing with these cases, are not able to look into them; because people were continually filling up the office, and occupying the whole attention of the employees at once for one particular case, and giving unnecessary trouble. (Hear, hear.) The department received letters at the rate of 1000 a month, and it was his (Mr. Cauchon's) intention to answer them all, and if the heads of departments are obliged in so doing to go into intricate

matters, and details respecting them, poring over assignments and other various documents, and if the rooms are to be filled continually with people, how was it probable that those at a distance could get any answer. These agents came to him and he treated them as he did other people--they earned their living honestly, but they were too solicitous, and in many case[s] insisted upon their cases being taken up before those of others who had the most right (hear, hear)--and they would exclaim, "Mr. Spragge is the only man that can deal with my case;" and another man would come and<sup>56</sup> say, "Mr. Spragge has a spite against me--therefore I shan't go near him, I will go to Mr. Tarbut."<sup>57</sup> Another would say, "Mr. Jones is the best man, and he can write ten times quicker than Mr. Spragge." They all came with different opinions about the officers. Was it right for any member of the community so to act?<sup>58</sup> Ought such a state of things to be allowed to exist? Surely not. Such a species of favoritism should be at once put down. There ought not to be more confidence placed in one public officer than another, where both did their duty equally well. What matter was it who gave the required information? The information was always supplied, and he defied any man to say that he had refused him any information--or had not given it as speedily as it was possible to give it.<sup>59</sup> Now, if he (Mr. C.) had refused any applicant requiring information which it was possible to give, let them come and accuse him. (Hear, hear.) He thought that was a fair proposition. Why, there were books missing in the department at this moment. (Hear, hear.) If the department was to be considered a public thoroughfare, why did not every cabman in the street come there and show his right. Not only books had been taken, but "field notes" had been cut out. (Hear, hear.)<sup>60</sup> Maps too, had been taken away, and if the department was made a thoroughfare this would always be recurring. No men could carry on the business of the department after the method proposed by the hon. member.<sup>61</sup> The hon. gentleman wanted that he (Mr. C.), as the head of the department, should not meddle with its affairs, and that people might do as they pleased with it.<sup>62</sup> The applications were to be made, and answers furnished and business done by the Clerks without his intervention. Every one must know the business better than he. He was not to meddle with it though he was the only person responsible to the country. The clerks might do as they liked without his knowledge or censure<sup>63</sup>. Thousands of letters had been written in his name, which he had never seen, and had been astonished to hear of. (Hear, hear.) He had, however, considered in the face of all this, that when the responsibility of the office had been imposed upon him, he should at least know what was going on in it.<sup>64</sup> A department thus carried on must be thoroughly disorganised, and he had endeavoured to reform it. The responsibility of the department rested on him, and he had established this new system simply to enable all applicants to be treated alike, and receive equal facilities. Let any poor man come and say he had not taken even more trouble for him than for other men. He did so for such men because they often did not know how to transact business for themselves.<sup>65</sup> As to the complaint that one or two of the clerks lost his time by the routine of getting the questions written down, he would merely ask was it not better they should lose their time than forty clerks? But he denied there was any losing of time at all in the arrangement. The fact of the matter was that such an arrangement had been so much liked, that<sup>66</sup> the hon. member for Kent and the hon. member next to him<sup>67</sup> had presented him with letters from their constituents, in which these hon. members had been besought to thank him (Mr. C.) for his courtesy and attention to their wants. When those letters had been shown to him, however, he said he had merely done his duty, and therefore did not require thanks, although he felt grateful for them. The hon. member for Glengary also asserted that the clerks in the office were not the responsible parties, and that the responsibility rested with the head of the department. Now he (Mr. C.) would

ask if he were the re[s]ponsible party, how it came to be unnecessary that he should make himself acquainted with the working and results of the system?<sup>68</sup> If copies of papers were demanded he wished them to be made by some person over whom he could exercise a supervision. But it was said, though he might have some talent, he had no experience and could not know what was wanted.<sup>69</sup> He did think that after twelve months labor to make himself acquainted with all the details of the office, some deference should be paid to him on the subject, but if he was mistaken in the course that he had been and was pursuing, he would upon conviction be disposed to change his opinion. (Hear, hear.)<sup>70</sup> But he would never yield to any unjust pressure. He would always be prepared to yield to the pressure of reason and facts; and nothing could be fairer than that.<sup>71</sup> The regulations were complained of, but no one could shew that any evil had occurred from it. It was only by the means he adopted he could know what was done in the department, for while he was responsible, according to the hon. member, he had only to go there and sit down, and now and then sign a document and be a tool of the employees of the department. He could not consent to hold office on these terms. He must know what was going on as he had to bear the responsibility.<sup>72</sup> He would accept all the responsibility of the office, or not hold it at all. Now there was another question to which the hon. gentleman had alluded, as to the change of clerks. That hon. gentleman wanted to hold, that he (Mr. C.) had no more right to deal with his clerks than with the business of the department. He had thought proper to make changes among the clerks, when necessary for the benefit of the department.<sup>73</sup> He would ask, had he not a right to provide an efficient staff of clerks? (Hear, hear.) Unless on the other principle of the member for Glengary that he (Mr. C.) had no right to know every thing that passed in his department, he did not see why he was not justified in removing those clerks who had not performed their duty.<sup>74</sup> That change became necessary. He found that there was another Commissioner[ship] set up in the Department. A Government within a Government.<sup>75</sup> He was three weeks receiving one single paper from a particular branch of the department, while five clerks were working there. What did he do? Why what he would do to-morrow. He knew that the object was to prove, that his position as Commissioner of Crown Lands was against the interest of the public, and he had intended to prove that it was not so, and he gave a perfect understanding to that branch, that he would sweep away the whole of it, if it so continued.<sup>76</sup> And what was the result? In three days afterwards he received a great deal of work from that very office. He did not mean to go very fully into this matter, for he was not going to be dragged into a discussion respecting the officers under his control. From such a discussion, however, he had nothing to fear. He had never favored any man to the prejudice of another. If he had done so, he could not occupy his present proud position. As in all the other offices of the Government there were, no doubt, spies in his department.<sup>77</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>78</sup> He did not fear them, nor would he shrink from the most thorough investigation of his conduct.<sup>79</sup> In conferring the office of Commissioner of Crown Lands on him, they [the Government] did so under the belief that he would do his duty faithfully and impartially. That department much needed reform, for it was well known that there had been more complaints of its management than of any other department of government.<sup>80</sup> (Hear, hear.)<sup>81</sup> Again, it had been asserted, that speculation had being (*sic*) going on among the officers of that department, but he would say that, if such were the case, he had not been able to ascertain it. It was in order to have full proof of such circumstances, that he had taken the whole matter into his hands, and established those rules to which exception had been taken. A moment's consideration would convince any person that, in making rules for the officers of the department, he could not make any exception for those who were not supposed to be guilty.<sup>82</sup> The clerks used to come at ten,

half-past ten or eleven, and then spend time in reading newspapers, smoking and lounging. They roamed about the offices on the pretence of business, and staid to chat with their fellow clerks. He had to prevent these things, and to prevent their going away at noon to lunch and wasting an hour and a half.<sup>83</sup> The consequence was, that when he accepted office, he was forced to be rude to those gentlemen, and immediately institute a sweeping reform. Many of these gentlemen, however, expressed their readiness to support him; and accordingly new and more stringent regulations were immediately enforced. Subsequently the admission of the public was interdicted, except on business. In speaking thus of officers, he did not mean to include them all. Some of those gentlemen were most efficient and hard working. Many of them went to business at nine o'clock in the morning, and worked till four in the afternoon; and again from six o'clock p.m. until one or two o'clock a.m. And yet these gentlemen never complained of the regulations in any way. The complaints had emanated from those officers who had not performed their duty. On account of making those changes, he was very unpopular among the officers--some of whom had even gone so far as to tell him that if the Government were overthrown, they would subscribe 500L to prevent his re-election.<sup>84</sup> (Hear, hear.) But as he was not elected by them, if he was to fall, it would not be through their agency. (Hear, hear.) He had also been unpopular among the land agents because ... he could not give them their information as speedily as they wished for it<sup>85</sup>. It was asked if all had to go through him. How would business go on in his absence? He had a secretary, a man in whom he could place confidence, who could attend to routine business in his absence, leaving more important matters for his direction.<sup>86</sup> With reference to his own conduct as head of the department, he would say that he always attended the important and intricate cases sent in; and had, in fact, devoted more time and attention to his department than any other man had done.<sup>87</sup> He had done all he could; had attended at the offices from half-past nine, a.m., to about five p.m., and executed his business, and had occasionally sat up till three in the morning, to expedite the business. (Hear, hear.) Then, as to the fishing question, he was ashamed of the hon. member bringing forward such a matter before the House. (Hear, hear.) If that hon. gentleman meant to charge him with taking his meals there, the hon. gentleman had been in the habit, for three or four years<sup>88</sup> while Speaker<sup>89</sup>, of taking his in one of the rooms of the House. He did not know whether he [Mr. J.S. Macdonald] had eaten fish, but probably he had--(Hear, hear.)--and no complaint had been made of that.<sup>90</sup> He (Mr. C.) in making his present arrangement had done so of necessity. Having all his papers and documents there, and all his time being, ... in fact, too little for the accomplishment of the business of his office,--he had decided on taking his meals in his apartment. This was the dreadful crime which had excited the indignation of the hon. member for Glengarry! In conclusion, the hon. gentleman stated he had answered all the cases preferred, but if there were any new facts brought forward in answer, he would be very happy to answer them.<sup>91</sup>

MR. POWELL regretted that the hon. mover of this motion should have read from a newspaper an extract that might have been considered personal to the hon. commissioner of Crown Lands. He regretted, also, that the remarks had been of rather a discursive character, and that the subject had not been confined to what he considered to be the real question at issue, viz:<sup>92</sup> whether a public department should be opened to the public or not. He thought it should be opened, and he believed the public would insist upon it.<sup>93</sup> Upon his arrival in this city he found it necessary to go to the Crown Lands office to transact business which had been confided to him by numbers of his constituents. Upon his arrival there he found that he was denied

admission. An order had been given by the Commissioner by which the public were excluded. He was, however, invited by the secretary, or some person connected with the department, to enter the Commissioner's office, but he was informed that any business he had to do might be done through him, and that he would be happy to attend to it.<sup>94</sup> He had no complaint to make of discourtesy; on the contrary, the demeanour of the commissioner had been most courteous towards him.<sup>95</sup> The speaker said that whilst willing to admit the truth of some of the Commissioner's statement, he was not prepared to adopt the sentiments enunciated by that honourable gentleman. The Commissioner of Crown Lands has attempted to justify the closing of his department to the public, and says that since the introduction of the new system, more information has been given than under the old order of things. He says that 414 inquiries were answered in two weeks under the new system. This does not bear in the slightest degree on the point in question. This large number of applications is, to a great degree, accounted for by the large influx of members of Parliament. The speaker said that the Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had not established it as a fact that, by the new system, more questions were answered than under the old system. He said that he himself had from twenty to twenty-five matters relative to Crown Lands confided to his care by his constituents, matters in which he had no personal interest. They were varied in their character, and were connected with several departments of the Crown Land Office. When he reached the ante-room it was full of applicants.<sup>96</sup> [He] had to wait a considerable time mingled up with a crowd which he found not very pleasant.<sup>97</sup>

Hear, hear from the Ministerial side.<sup>98</sup>

[MR. POWELL continued:] If he could have gone to the different rooms and obtained the desired information by personal application, he would have finished the business much sooner than he did. The Hon. Commissioner cites the case of a speculator in Crown Lands, who, under the old system, kept one of his clerks engaged for several hours. He would ask the hon. gentleman, if the same might not as likely happen now? If an individual, under the present order of things, must write out the particulars of his case, is it not consistent that more time would be consumed than before. The hon. gentleman tells the House that over a thousand letters were, under the old system, written in his name without his knowledge. Might not the same thing happen now as then?<sup>99</sup> Shutting the doors would not prevent Mr. Spragge or Mr. Jones, from being written to, or writing in reply.<sup>100</sup> The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands says that in ninety-nine out of a hundred cases the inquiries are unimportant ones with which he has nothing to do. Yet he is to take the charge of all this business in his own hands. Applicants are kept waiting in the ante-room for a long time<sup>101</sup>. He, as a representative of the people, felt he was placed in a humiliating position, by being kept waiting in the ante-room amid a crowd of strangers. It placed members in a humiliating position; it was an indignity not only to himself but to his constituents.<sup>102</sup> The Hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands tells us that many maps, books and papers have been defaced and destroyed. The speaker thought it extraordinary that the head of a department should thus publicly cast reflection on his subordinates. If he had clerks in his employ not to be confided in, it was his duty to discharge them. The Commissioner says that the clerks were in the habit of leaving the office at lunch time. Shall they then be locked up, or shall they be dictated to as to how and where they shall eat their lunch.<sup>103</sup> If such are the only reasons which he has to offer, they would be far from satisfactory to the public. They were desirous (*sic*), and it was right that they should know how these lands were disposed of. In some cases the rights of squatters were respected, in other

cases they were totally disregarded.<sup>104</sup> One branch indeed required reform. If he would provide for a better system with respect to the agents and the entry of lands by them, it would be most desirable. As to denying the public access to the department, he believed it an infringement<sup>105</sup> of the rights of the public, who were justly entitled to free access to all the information they sought, without those needless restrictions which the Crown Land Commissioner had injudiciously imposed, and which he thought should at once be done away with.<sup>106</sup>

MR. GALT said he had listened with a great deal of interest to what had fallen from the hon. Crown Land Commissioner, and he concurred fully in most [of] those observations and he was of opinion that great improvements had been made in the department (sic) under the able supervis[i]on of the Hon. Commissioner. That gentlemen (sic) had been blamed for the course which he had taken, but it should be borne in mind that for a series of years great complaints had been made against the working of that Department, and as under our present system the Hon. Gentlemen (sic) was responsible for that Department, was it right in the face of those very numerous complaints that he should be blamed in his endeavours to work out what he had conceived would be an improvement? It was his bounden duty to acquaint himself with everything which was going on in his Department, at the same time he would be willing to admit that the principle which he had introduced may be carried too far<sup>107</sup>, so far as to impede public business. A great department like that of the Crown Lands was required to be easy of access<sup>108</sup>. The views of the hon. member for Glengarry and others may, he conceived, be met without any great departure from the general principle which had been laid down. As for instance, when parties applied in reference to any particular lot of land, these applicants would be very properly referred to a separate Department, the head of which would furnish the information without the necessity of a direct reference to the Commissioner, as he need only be applied to in case of a sale taking place; and such a course would very much facilitate the replies to a very large majority of applicants.<sup>109</sup> A great deal of trouble arose from the undue amount of labour thrown upon the department by the people having access to the clerks, and to which the attention of the committee over which he presided last year had been attracted.<sup>110</sup> The Committee on the subject stated, that several modifications might be introduced into the department with advantage.<sup>111</sup> As Chairman ... he would say that they were not able, up to a late period of the last session, to get a full Report from that committee for the general information of the House. One fact he would mention, which was certainly worthy of immediate attention, that some of the accounts of the local agents had not then been audited; and, indeed, no vouchers were produced, and the Commissioner of course did not know if those accounts were correct, although thousands of pounds had passed through the hands of these gentlemen. It was not his (Mr. P's) intention to even hint that those accounts are not correct, but he certainly would like to hear from the Commissioner of Crown Lands if those accounts of the local agents had been looked into. In conclusion, he would remark, that the evils which were complained of in this department may be easily obviated.<sup>112</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE understood from the observations of hon. gentlemen that in land transactions with the Crown Land Department the means of access was not so free as it had heretofore been--at the same time absurd complaints had been made that documents had been abstracted from that department; and if so, it was very desirable that such very free access should not be had. He was quite astonished that the hon. member for Glengarry, who was always considered a Reformer, did not agree in the reforms which the Commissioner of Crown Lands had endeavoured to effect in his

department; for his own part, he (Mr. Dufresne) gave very great credit to the Commissioner for the reforms which he had brought forward, and which doubtless were intended for the public good. There was one expression which had fallen from the member for Glengarry, which he probably, upon reflection, would be sorry for. The hon. gentleman has said that a subordinate officer should have the power to make a Report of his Department without the cognizance or sanction of his superior, but surely the hon. gentleman must perceive that such argument does away with, at last strikes at the very root, of our system of "Responsible Government", and that the act of a Sub-officer making such report without the consent of his superior officer never could be sanctioned in this House or by the country.<sup>113</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said he had been misunderstood. He had [made] reference to the required evidence of Mr. Spragge before that committee.<sup>114</sup> Mr. Spragge's private opinion had been asked for on the subject, and he could not see the difference between written evidence and evidence viva voce.<sup>115</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said that it was the rule for subordinates to ask leave of absence in order to give evidence.<sup>116</sup> Any clerks who intimated that his evidence before any committee was required had always his (Mr. Cauchon's) permission to attend.<sup>117</sup>

MR. DUFRESNE, continued, he certainly understood the hon. member for Glengarry to say that a sub-officer should have leave to make out his report, but as it now appears that it is not what he intended to say, his admission must be received. One other point he would refer to, the fact of the hon. member for Glengarry having read a long article from a newspaper, the London Free Press, in reference to an applicant to the Crown Land Department,<sup>118</sup> an hon. gentleman of this House<sup>119</sup> who had been told to make his application in writing, but who in the face of that information, he had thought fit to force through the door and into the very presence of the Commissioners (sic) of Crown Lands. He ... thought that if the Editor of the Free Press had any regard for that party he would not have thus heralded his outrage to the world; and if he had known how to conduct himself as a gentleman he would not have been guilty of that outrage in a public department; and if such conduct was repeated it certainly may be considered necessary that the Commissioners (sic) of Crown Lands should place additional locks upon his door. It has been argued that we must yield to public feeling in this matter. It had been generally admitted that great abuses had arisen in the Department of Crown Lands; and with such facts before him it was the duty of the commissioner to apply himself to a reform in that department--and the course he had taken was this: he said "I am the head of this department--I am responsible for what takes place--there are great complaints--I will apply myself so as to thoroughly acquaint myself with what is taking place--and what I conceive to be wrong I will have changed." And it was his (Mr. D's) opinion that these changes will be for the general Government of the country, and those evils which had been so long complained of could not now take place, when a few hon. gentlemen could not have access, and by their sole knowledge of locations, field notes, and general information, as was the case when scrip was in existence, and by which means many had realized large fortunes in the country, and this they had been able to accomplish through the connivance of Clerks in the Crown Land Office, and without the knowledge of the superior in that department, and these things had been carried on for the purpose of speculation, to the great injury of the poorer man, the bona fide settler of the country, who, when he applies finds this lot, and that lot, and almost every lot in both Upper and Lower Canada, are taken up as soon as the lands

are declared open for sale.<sup>120</sup> Many times we find lands in the hands of unknown people, and this course of things results in driving many to seek for land in the States.<sup>121</sup> Such had been the general rule, and for the best interests of the Province, it was highly desirable that such proceedings should be put a stop to in this country and it was his opinion that the course pursued by the Commissioner of Crown Lands would be the means of changes in the system, and very great credit was due to him for his exertions. Doubtless he would be met with great opposition, and to some parties he must necessarily give offence, because there were unfortunately many gentlemen who were still desirous of speculating in these lands of the Crown. Still it was his opinion that there was sufficient independence in the House to sustain the hon. Commissioner in the rules and regulations which he had laid down. At the same time he was of opinion that if it could be shown that any of them were objectionable, and not conducive to the public good, upon such representations being made to the hon. Commissioners, he was quite sure there would be every disposition to modify them. Meantime he (Mr. D.) should oppose the address.<sup>122</sup>

MR. ROBINSON was of opinion that an erroneous impression was current amongst the members who had taken part in the discussion. They spoke of these complaints as if they were only matters of yesterday, whereas the complaints against the Crown Land Department were of long standing.<sup>123</sup> It was not fair to condemn the system till it had been fairly tried. He thought the hon. member for Glengary had stated his case a little too strong. The office was not closed. True, it was not agreeable that<sup>124</sup> every applicant could be allowed access to every office in that Department instead of that particular one to which alone he had to be directed. He (Mr. Robinson) had had some considerable experience in land departments connected with the Canada Company, who granted as many patents, and had equal or more applicants than what came before the Crown Lands Department. The Company had a sales-room, and all applications in reference to the sale of lots had to be made there, and the enquiries were quickly made as to any particular lots, and as quickly answered, mostly in five minutes. Allowance, however, would at all times have to be made for the extent of the information and the number of applicants at the particular moment.<sup>125</sup> He would even advocate a more stringent course when a department was so entangled in difficulties. Like the merchant in similar circumstances, he thought the best way to straighten up was to close the doors<sup>126</sup> of the Department for a time, in order to take stock, and see what lands were sold and what were open for sale, but with all the complaints of the innovations of the Commissioners (sic) of Crown Lands, he had not yet gone so far in his Reforms. He (Mr. Robinson) had had considerable experience in the Department while in Quebec, and he had [gone] there to make many applications for his clients, and those applications he made in writing, and could not do otherwise than acknowledge that they were promptly attended to. There was one subject of general complaint arising from recent acts which had passed, as to the actual settlement upon the land before purchase, by which means a man could not go into the Land Office with the money in his pocket and purchase, and on this account very many were driven elsewhere.<sup>127</sup> This is a well known fact. It is only actual settlers who can obtain lands. Another reason of the difficulty of the hon. Commissioner's labours was the partial occupation of his time with his duties as a member of Parliament. He thought that the House should encourage the hon. Commissioner in his reformatory measures.<sup>128</sup> As to the complaints which had been made, he thought them unjust. All had expected that some sweeping changes would be made in the Crown Lands Department, and now [that] they had been [e]ffected it appeared they did not give satisfaction. As to the argument that clerks should be allowed to open, read and reply to letters, such was a perfect absurdity, as no regular department in a well-regulated country would allow it.<sup>129</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD here remarked that he did not contend for this.<sup>130</sup>

MR. ROBINSON continued.--As a committee had already been appointed, the present discussion had occupied too much of the more valuable time of the House, and as to the complaint that these changes had been made by an order in Council, he was of opinion that there was but few members of the House who would for a moment give credence to the rumour. He would remark in conclusion that from all he had heard, and the remarks were very general, that of late there had been a very great improvement in the conduct of the business of the Crown Land Department. Great complaints had been made for the past twenty years against this Department, and though much had been done, yet much remained to be amended, and it was to be trusted it would very shortly be accomplished.<sup>131</sup>

MR. MURNEY said that he believed he was the person alluded to in the extract which had been read by the hon. member for Glengarry--but the statements were entirely incorrect. He was not at all responsible for their appearance. The statement mixed up certain matter which took place in Montreal at the time when this system was tried there, and found totally to fail, with what took place the other morning in the Crown Lands office here. But while repudiating this statement as at all a correct account of what did take place, he would say, that if the Commissioner of Crown Lands would put up in his office a notice stating that public business was done here privately, it would be about a correct idea of what is the facts of the case. He was willing to accept the explanation of the Commissioner, but at the same time would tell him that he was attempting what could not be done. Not only so, but by such a practice he casts a reflection upon his clerks. They mix themselves up personally and individually with the public business, and people will not be slow to say for their own benefit. He casts reflection also upon all the gentlemen who go to that department for the purpose of making enquiry into the affairs of that department. He is subjecting himself to the same reflections. At this moment it is said that the hon. gentleman locks himself up amongst his papers and maps. For what purpose?<sup>132</sup> Ill-natured people might say<sup>133</sup>, for the purpose of examining these papers and maps in order to make himself rich by speculating in the public lands. The hon. gentleman speaks of two land agents coming in and employing his clerk's time for the whole day. It is barely impossible that such a thing could take place; but if it did, it would save them being pestered by a great many people to put questions to them about these very same lands.<sup>134</sup> Agents, even if they occupied some of the Clerks, for a whole day actually saved the time of the Department and of the public. The business was done much sooner through them than if all principals had remained with the Officers.<sup>135</sup> If when you went to make enquiry about any thing connected with this department you are ushered into a room where there are perhaps twenty or thirty persons sitting, all requesting similar information, and each one has to write his information upon a slip of paper, the clerk runs off to get an answer, and, after a few minutes, comes back to make some enquiries as to the kind of information wanted, and off he goes again and returns, it may be with the answers wanted. Such a system would never work. If the people who had business to do there had access to some clever gentlemen, who understood the business, they would get the answers they wanted at once. This system as he had before said was done in Montreal, and almost every one expressed their indignation at it, and expressed it in such a way that he thought it would not be attempted to put any of the public department under lock and key. The hon. gentleman would perhaps remember the speech made by the hon. Malcolm Cameron upon that occasion (sic). There was such an expression of opinion as induced the hon. Commissioner to open his doors

forthwith. It was found that it did not answer the purpose. The hon. Commissioner says, that so many thousands of letters have been received, but how can he compare these with the questions which were answered in former years under the old system. It would seem that they were bound to take this statement upon his word, as showing that more business had been done under the present system than in former years. He almost questioned it. He was satisfied that more business could be done in half an hour formerly, than in two days by the system of writing notes. He was willing, however, to see how far the system would work, but was satisfied that the same was not far distant when there would be a universal expression of opinion against it. The people would not go there and sit down in an ante-room to wait until his lordship of the Crown Lands would condescend to receive them.<sup>136</sup> Whereas if an opportunity was offered to make one question, the result would be sufficiently satisfactory.<sup>137</sup>

MR. SOL. GEN. H. SMITH considered that the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands had defended himself most ably. He concurred in the remarks of the hon. member for Sherbrooke, at the same time there was another branch of the subject referred to by the hon. member for Simcoe which ought to be considered. It was well known that the Crown Lands never was a popular department, and he thought it likely to be more unpopular now, in consequence of the change of the law in 1853<sup>138</sup>. The commissioner is making innovations on the old system, and those who have had the run of the department are jealous of their old privileges. The act of 1853 did not work well. Under its provisions only actual settlers can purchase lands. It is the state of the law which makes the department unpopular.<sup>139</sup> The consequence is, that persons who want to speculate in land cannot get land to purchase, and they go to the United States to make purchases.<sup>140</sup> When he first heard of the new regulation he was as much opposed to it as the hon. gentlemen opposite, but having business to transact there he had found no difficulty in getting through with it.<sup>141</sup> He was free to confess that, having seen the working of the new system, he was convinced of its utility. He spoke then of the objections to be urged against clerks making reports independent of their superior officer. If the Commissioner examined all the affairs of the department, the public would be better satisfied of the faithful performance of the labours of the department. He said that he had seen the beneficial results of the new system. It has been stated that the office was shut up. The Commissioner has never refused an interview with any one on business.<sup>142</sup> As to the indignity of waiting in an ante-room, he thought the hon. gentleman was over sensitive. He went to the Postmaster General's office himself to-day, and was made to wait in an ante-room. Every one must in the public departments wait their turn to confer with its head--the poor man and rich alike; that was the only fair way to carry on the public business.<sup>143</sup> He was proud to hear the Commissioner say that each man in his turn would be attended to. He did not consider the present as the proper time to discuss the general subject of the Crown Lands.<sup>144</sup> He hoped that hon. members opposite would suspend their judgment until they see the operations of the change which has been introduced.<sup>145</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD said that he gave much credit to the hon. Commissioner for his reforms. He trusted that the denial of the hon. member for Hastings would be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.<sup>146</sup> He had no fault personally to find, having always been treated very courteously by the Commissioner. He did not think, however, that any argument had been brought forward to show that they ought to suspend their design upon this question. If, as the Commissioner complains, the clerks have not done their duty, no one in this House, he was sure, would ever complain if he

dismissed them, but would rather give him credit for his determination to get the abuses that had crept into that department remedied.<sup>147</sup> He (the speaker) never expects the hon. Commissioner to be a mere cypher in the department. It was desirable that he should revise the accounts and business of the office. But is it to be expected that he can report on all the minute details of the department? No. He must have men under him in whom he can place confidence, who shall make the preliminary reports. Ninety-nine out of a hundred questions are preliminary ones which may be answered without the interference of the head of the department. It was quite clear that an assistant Commissioner was needed. The present reform was not one calculated to give satisfaction to the people of Canada. As regards the loss of maps and books there is no office which is not exposed, in some degree, to pilfering. He believed that the present discussion would awaken public opinion. He thought that in some respects the hon. Commissioner of Crown Lands must make some changes in order to satisfy public opinion.<sup>148</sup>

MR. WILSON stated that not being aware of the rule, he had occasion to call in reference to some little commission business entrusted to him by some of his constituents referring especially to this department. But the fact was, that the enquiries were so trivial that he was really ashamed to apply formally to the Crown Lands Commissioner for [t]he information he wanted. He did not complain of the application of such a rule, but he complained that the rule was so very stringent as to exclude all classes of enquiry. If that was really the case, it was utterly impossible for the head of a department, no matter what amount of zeal and ability he possessed, to attend to the duties which would thereby devolve upon him. He was quite sure the rule would never work.<sup>149</sup> The hon. Commissioner had told the House that there were those in his department of whom he was suspicious. He had told them that his suspicions amounted to a moral persuasion in his own mind of their untrustworthiness, though not sufficient to convict them of misdemeanour.<sup>150</sup> If he has moral evidence against any of them, he (Mr. Wilson) was quite sure this House would most readily sustain him if he dismissed them even upon that novel evidence. He would refer the hon. Commissioner to the state of things in England in one of the last volumes of Macaulay's history, he refers to the operations of the Place Bill, and in speaking of the exclusion of the subordinate functionaries from the House of Commons, he say[s], "They are now excluded, and the consequence is, that the State possesses a valuable body of servants who remain unchanged, while Cabinet after Cabinet is formed and dissolved, who instructs every successive (sic) member in his duties, and with whom it is the most sacred point of honor to give true information, source of advice, and strenuous assistance to their superior for the time being. To the experience, the ability and fidelity of his class of men, is to be attributed the ease and safety with which the direction of affairs (sic) has been many times in their own memory, transferred from Tories to Whigs and from Whigs to Tories." The staff officers of the Department ought to be men of that class. Men of honor and integrity, and certainly above suspicion. They would be discreet, discriminating and faithful. He did not find fault with the Commissioner making improvements in the working of the department,<sup>151</sup> but he was of opinion that it was wrong to exclude the public from the offices of the department. He thought it the duty of the head of the department to uphold its credit and not to slander its subordinates before the House.<sup>152</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD having been asked to withdraw his motion, said he would do so if there were no orders in council in connection with the subject.<sup>153</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said the only order in council was to the effect, that the clerks come to the office at 9 o'clock in the morning.<sup>154</sup>

MR. J.S. MACDONALD withdrew his motion<sup>155</sup>.

It being six o'clock, MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER left the chair<sup>156</sup>, and the House took a recess till 7½ P.M.<sup>157</sup>

(98)

*On motion of Mr. Dufresne, seconded by Mr. Gill,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of all Documents containing accusations against Alexander Daly, Esquire, Crown Land Agent for the County of Leinster, from the 1st of June, 1854, to the 1st of January, 1856, whether Petitions, Memorials, Letters, or other Documents, together with a list of the names of persons bringing forward such accusations, and also the replies, answers, or justification offered by the said A. Daly, to the said accusations; and lastly, all the correspondence which has taken place during the above-mentioned period between the Government and the said Alexander Daly, and any other persons, in relation to the conduct of the latter as a Public Officer; also, for copies of all detailed accounts furnished by the said A. Daly to the Government, of the expenses incurred for the exploration of a Road in the Township of Chertsey.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor*

(99)

*General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Dufresne have leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Circuit Court in the County of Montcalm.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Brown have leave to bring in a Bill to protect the Employés of the Government of this Province, in certain Departments of the Public Service, from being compelled to labor on the Lord's day.<sup>158</sup>*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Wednesday next.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the provisions of the several Acts for the Incorporation of the City of Montreal.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*On motion of Mr. Christie, seconded by Mr. Hartman,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of all correspondence which may have passed between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government, since the ninth day of May, eighteen hundred and fifty-three, on the subject of the Clergy Reserves; and also, copies of all correspondence which may have passed between the Government of Canada, or any member thereof, and any Clergyman or Dignitary of the Churches of England or Scotland, or of the Church of Rome, or of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, or their Agents or Attorneys, since the ninth day of May, eighteen hundred and fifty-three, on the subject of the commutation of the claims of any of the said Clergymen or Churches on the Clergy Reserve Fund.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

MR. A. DORION (Montreal) moved for an address to His Excellency relative to certain Municipal Debentures of the County of Terrebonne, which had been exchanged by the Receiver General for Provincial Debentures.<sup>159</sup>

MR. PROV. SEC. CARTIER presented the return to an address of the Legislative Assembly for a statement of the sums obtained by municipalities in Upper and Lower Canada under the municipal loan fund act. He said that probably this embraced the returns desired by the hon. member for Montreal.<sup>160</sup>

(99)

*The Honorable Mr. Cartier, one of Her Majesty's Executive Council, presented, pursuant to an Address to His Excellency the Governor General,--Return to an Address from the Legislative Assembly, dated the twenty-eighth ultimo, for a Statement of sums obtained by Municipalities in Upper and Lower Canada, under the Municipal Loan Fund Act, 16 Vic., cap. 22, together with certain information relating thereto.*

*For the said Return, see Appendix (No. 14.)*

MR. A. DORION said it did not. His object was to move an address, with the view [of] having a committee of enquiry at a future day as to the mode in which certain debentures of the municipality of Terrebonne<sup>161</sup> had been exchanged for Government debentures, under the Municipal Loan Fund Act of Lower Canada passed last session. By these changes the Government had made itself a creditor of these municipalities, and they had done so, as they alleged, under the act already mentioned.<sup>162</sup> The county of Terrebonne being desirous of aiding the Montreal and Bytown Railroad, passed on the 12th December, 1853, and the 12th March, 1854, two by-laws, authorising the mayor to subscribe for a certain amount of stock of the company for the purpose of assisting in the construction of the road. The stock was not to be subscribed in the name of the whole county, but certain sums were to be subscribed for certain parishes, to the extent of 10,000L each for St. Jerome and St. Martin, 5,000L for St[e]. Sophie, and 1,000L for the township of Abercrombie, in all 26,000L for those four parishes. The conditions under which this stock was to be subscribed by the mayor were, 1st. That a branch of the railway should be made to the village of St. Jerome, one of the subscribing parishes. 2nd. That station houses should be made, one in St. Martin, and another in St. Jerome. And 3rd. That no debentures were to be issued except as the calls would be made by the company, and that these debentures would only bear interest from the time the railroad was completed, and proclamation made to that effect in the *Gazette*. These conditions, however, had not been complied with. The debentures were issued before the calls were made, and without any regard to the other conditions he had mentioned. He should mention also, that the law under which the by-laws were passed, requires a<sup>163</sup> two per cent sinking fund<sup>164</sup> to be provided for the payment of the principal, and a special tax to be levied for the payment of the interest. No such provision was made by those by-laws. Yet the debentures were issued, and passed into the hands of the Company, and if he was rightly informed, into the hands of several other individuals. All this took place previous to last session. By an act passed last session, the provisions of the municipal loan fund act of Upper Canada were extended to Lower Canada, and a special clause was introduced to give a retroactive effect to the act, so as to bring under it debentures which had been issued or which might be issued under

by-laws passed previous to the passing of the act.<sup>165</sup> He must here say that the mischief which had thus arisen had been foreseen and pointed out by himself and his friends at the time the Municipal Loan Fund Bill was introduced and carried last year.<sup>166</sup> Hon. members on his side of the House had not to charge themselves with having neglected their duty on that occasion, for certainly they had foreshadowed what would result, that the municipality of Terrebonne would be deprived of a large amount of debentures, issued contrary to the provisions of the by-law.<sup>167</sup> They opposed the retroactive effect of the proposed law, for they thought that effect would be made applicable to these very debentures. The particular case was pointed out to the Government but warning was of no use. All that could be obtained was the insertion of two provisos, which they, at the time, stated were not sufficient, but which the Inspector General insisted would prevent the evils to be opposed.<sup>168</sup> The first [was], that the monies to be raised on debentures should be paid or delivered by the Receiver General, only on the joint order of the municipality and the holder of the Debentures. The other proviso was that no money should be paid on the Debentures, if notice was given by any tax-payer that their validity was contested.<sup>169</sup> When the Bill came from the Committee the hon. member for Sherbrooke moved another proviso,<sup>170</sup> [which] also was inserted, that nothing in the act should apply to any loan which should have been negotiated by third parties, or to Debentures issued to third parties before the passing of the act.<sup>171</sup> Two Acts had been passed by Government in 1853, one in May, authorising County Councils in Lower Canada to take stock in Railways, under the restriction that any by-laws, authorising the taking of stock should be first submitted to the people. In June another act was passed, which provided that if the inhabitants of any one or more townships or parishes forming part of any county should desire to subscribe for stock in any railway, the Municipal Council of the county of which such parishes or township formed part might raise a loan for that purpose on the credit of the county, but hold the parishes or townships responsible for its payment.<sup>172</sup> Strange to relate, it gave power to the municipalities to dispense with the popular sanction, and to pass bye-laws for issuing debentures on the authority of the councillors alone for the separate municipalities. Another alteration was made by this second law of equally strange character, for while the county municipalities were restricted to the issue of 100,000L the municipalities were authorized to issue an unlimited amount for each parish. The bye-laws of the municipalities were passed under the second law,<sup>173</sup> [and] the debentures to which he referred were issued.<sup>174</sup> It should be remarked also that the Montreal and Bytown Railroad Company is a complete failure, that their works had been stopped for upwards of 18 months, and that they were notoriously bankrupt, not having a mile of road in operation. Yet from the information he had received, the exchange of Government Debentures for these Debentures had been made by the Receiver General without the order of the municipality, in violation of the proviso he had just quoted. On the 4th of June, before the exchange took place, if he had been correctly informed the mayor of the municipality wrote to the Receiver General, putting him on his guard. The mayor had that forenoon been solicited by the President and Directors of the Railroad to give the joint order, but he refused and wrote to the Receiver General a letter, in which after mentioning the state of the Company and that the conditions had not been complied with, he said--"It is for this reason that I beg of you to suspend any negotiations in this matter until after the reception of the deliberations of the Municipal Council." (Hear, hear.) Thus on the 5th of June, at the latest, the Receiver General was warned not to exchange those debentures because the conditions had not been complied with. Three weeks elapsed without any answer. On the 23rd June the mayor wrote a second letter, and on the 28th he received an answer from the Receiver General, informing him that he had received the letter of the 4th of June, and that an answer to it was contained in a

letter of the Deputy Receiver General enclosed. That letter stated--"You are labouring under a mistake when you conclude that the joint authority of the municipality and the holder of the municipal debentures is necessary by the Lower Canada Municipal Loan Fund Act. Such joint authority is only required when money is to be raised by the Receiver General on the debentures issued or to be issued under any by-law, and not in the case of the exchange of Provincial for municipal debentures." He (Mr. Dorion) would like some explanation from the Attorney General about this most extraordinary interpretation given of that clause of the act. (Hear, hear.) The singular thing was that the act, in no one single line of it, spoke of the exchange of debentures, except with the municipality, and he did not think it all possible, that the Receiver General or the Administration would be able to shield themselves under that plea. It must be looked at in one of two ways, either that the provincial debentures were considered as money, and given as such to the holders of the municipal debentures, or that<sup>175</sup> the Receiver General had no right to make the exchange, because, by the law, no exchange can be made unless by the Municipality. It seemed strange that Government should have made this exchange<sup>176</sup> when they had been notified that there was a difficulty in the matter, and when they knew that they were negotiating with a bankrupt concern. (Hear, hear.) The company knew perfectly well that the by-laws were invalid, and that the debentures had not been issued according to the prescribed conditions, and that they could not therefore, have made the municipality liable for them in a Court of law. But the debentures coming into the hands of the government, afforded the means of recovering their amount which the Company themselves could not have done. The government were in a very different position.--The Company would have had to go to a Court of law where they would have been opposed.--But the government, by the act, had merely to issue an order to the Sheriff, who would go to the country, and levy the amount without any judgment whatever. The position of the municipality was therefore greatly injured by this proceeding, the creditors being now the government instead of the railroad Company. They would have opposed the Company most successfully, as the Attorney General well knew,<sup>177</sup> for he held in his hand judgments delivered in the case of the Attorney General against the Municipality of Two Mountains, and the Attorney General vs the Municipality of Shefford, which judgments declared the debentures issued by those bodies invalid for precisely the same defect as existed in the debentures in question.<sup>178</sup> And yet, with that knowledge, the Attorney General reported on the by-laws under which those Debentures were issued, to the Executive Council, approving of them, preliminary to the Government exchanging Provincial for Municipal Debentures. (Hear, hear.) As he had stated, the parishes in Terrebonne which had subscribed the stock, never authorized the issue of such Debentures. They merely authorized their issue on conditions which were not fulfilled; and, moreover, the by-law was an absolute nullity, because it did not provide for a sinking fund. Yet the County of Terrebonne, which had not received a sixpence of value, would be bound to pay those Debentures--would be bound to pay for money which had gone into the pockets of individuals, it was not known whom. (Hear, hear.) The railway was only to pass through a corner of the county; but to induce the county to take shares, the Company bound themselves to make a branch railroad through the county,<sup>179</sup> to St. Jerome,<sup>180</sup> for a distance of twenty or thirty miles; and it was upon that condition that the subscriptions were made, and no interest was to be due till the railroad was completed. But for some reason, which was not now understood, the Debentures were issued unconditionally, and bearing interest at once.<sup>181</sup> Still the bye-laws had been published, every one knew the terms, and there was no doubt that unless these conditions were complied with, the claim could not be enforced.<sup>182</sup> Under those circumstances, he would ask whether the Attorney-General could think of

compelling the municipalities to pay those Debentures? 26,000L of Debentures had been issued; but it appeared that only 23,500L had been advanced by the Government, as a demand had been made on the municipality for interest only on that amount. He did not know whether the other 2,500L had since gone into the hands of the Receiver-General. But 30,000L more had been issued, under similar circumstances, by the County of Ottawa; so that there were now 53,500L of those Debentures in the hands of the Receiver-General--the whole of the money advanced on which, he was afraid, the Province in the end would have to lose. For, though the Government had the right to send the Sheriff and seize for the amount, he thought when the matter was brought before a court of justice, in the shape of an action for trespass, the Court would say that the Government could not properly claim the amount of those Debentures, issued (*sic*) under such circumstances, and for which no value had been received. These 53,000L, therefore, would be a dead loss to the Province, and why? because the Government needlessly, and for no earthly reason that he could see, chose to step in between the municipality and the holders of the Debentures, who could not themselves have enforced payment--and that, although the Government had been warned by the letter of the Mayor of the municipality, every one could see the invalidity of the flimsy pretext that it was not money but Provincial Debentures which had been given in exchange for the Municipal Debentures. The people would not have the consolation of knowing that the money had been applied for the amelioration or improvement of the county, but it was in the hands of they did not know whom. It was generally rumoured that a part of the sum, 1700L, was in the hands of the President to pay his salary<sup>183</sup>, a gentleman who had subscribed 300L of stock, and who had been voted a salary of 1,000L per annum.<sup>184</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--Order! You are not entitled to speak of rumours.<sup>185</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--I am entitled to say that this money has not been spent in the county for the benefit of the county, but has been squandered away, and am I not entitled to say how it has been applied?<sup>186</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--You are not moving for an enquiry, but for papers, and are not entitled to speak of the private conduct of those gentlemen.<sup>187</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--I am moving an Address, and wish to show my object for doing so.<sup>188</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER.--You ask for certain papers, and you have to state to the House your reasons for these returns.<sup>189</sup>

MR. A. DORION.--In moving for the papers, it is necessary to shew it is not a useless proceeding I am adopting, but that there is ground for demanding a Committee of Enquiry, such as is sought by petitions now before the House, as to how the Debentures came into the hands of the Government, and also as to the conduct of the administrators of the railroad. If I do not give reasons for the enquiry, the Government may say, you have shown no cause for getting those papers.<sup>190</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND.--The Government say no such thing. The Government are quite prepared to bring down these papers and to assist the hon. gentleman in getting an enquiry into the facts alleged in the petitions. The Government do not wish to prevent a disclosure of the facts, nor to prevent an enquiry into the manner in which they exchanged the Debentures. I am prepared to show, when the papers come

down, what the action of the Government was. But an enquiry should be made also as to the manner in which the debentures were disposed of by the Municipal Council<sup>191</sup>, for it appeared to him that the character of the debentures had been changed by the officers of the Municipalities themselves.<sup>192</sup>

MR. A. DORION said that that was not correct.<sup>193</sup> The Council complained that the Debentures had got into the hands of the Government without their participation, and that the Government very improperly exchanged Provincial Debentures for them to the holders who could never themselves have recovered them. And it was for that reason they pressed an enquiry into the transaction, as also into the manner in which the affairs of the Bytown Railroad had been conducted.<sup>194</sup> The Municipalities would let the Government sue before any court of law and they did not fear the result.<sup>195</sup> But what they feared was the summary power of the Government to go and seize the goods and chattels of the individuals comprising the municipalities, and thus they wished to stop [it] by an enquiry. He would like to hear the Attorney General explain how he came to give an opinion that those by-laws were correct in the face of two judgments in suits to which he was himself a party declaring that exactly similar by-laws were not correct. (Hear, hear.)<sup>196</sup> He [Mr. Dorion] held that the debentures were invalid under the bye-law, but he went further than that, and said that even if they had been all correct the Government should not have proceeded with the negotiation; often they had been warned against it by the Mayor of the County.<sup>197</sup>

MR. BELLINGHAM asserted that the hon. gentleman had wandered from what he (Mr. B.) considered his legitimate course of action was, and that he had entered into considerations involving private character<sup>198</sup>, and he was sure he would not have advanced such arguments unless for the purpose of making out a case against Government.<sup>199</sup> The President of the Montreal and Bytown Railway Company had never received any of the debentures and had instead of 300L, subscribed 1000L to the Stock.<sup>200</sup>

MR. SICOTTE the SPEAKER called the hon. member to order.<sup>201</sup>

MR. BELLINGHAM thought it was fair that an explanation should be given by him, after what had fallen from the hon. gentleman. He had imputed to the Government wilful conduct in disregarding a law in relation to certain monied securities. Now if he (Mr. B.) understood the matter at all, the Government had no power whatever to reject those securities offered to them, and were bound to exchange them. They were in the shape of certain municipal bonds, and when presented, they were bound to accept them. The only question was, whether these parties went before the Government or not. He (Mr. B.) believed that they had, and he had a better opportunity of knowing the fact than the learned gentleman who had spoken. The matter indeed was conducted in a very regular form. He believed that the hon. member was the legal adviser of the City Council of Montreal in the matter. It was a great misfortune that in Lower Canada so much distrust and reluctance should have existed to incur taxation for railway enterprise. But upon the strength of the votes of the two counties of Two Mountains and Terrebonne, the English Contractor had commenced the works of the railroad in question.<sup>202</sup> He stated that the Counties of Two Mountains and Montreal had also taken stock largely in that road<sup>203</sup>; [they] unfortunately did not pay their funds in, and the only funds that the Company had in their hands, were those belonging to the two other counties named,<sup>204</sup> Terrebonne and Ottawa<sup>205</sup>, and with these Debentures they paid the contractors the first instalment, and which

absorbed the whole Debentures. The counties of Two Mountains and Montreal (the latter being most especially interested in the matter) had behaved in a manner which in private life would be called highly dishonourable in a cash point of view. They had not acted up to their pledges as to taking stock. He believed that the counties of Terrebonne and Ottawa were most anxious to promote the construction of the road, and they had executed a certain number of Debentures which had passed into the hands of the contractors. These counties were undoubtedly very much benefited by these Debentures having passed into the hands of the government, instead of being held by twenty different persons. If other parties had come forward and sued the counties, the counties would be liable upon the Debentures.<sup>206</sup> It was true that bye-laws were passed, but that there was no mention of the bye-law on the face of the debentures which were therefore like notes of hand.<sup>207</sup> The contractors, however, did not pass them into third hands. It was true they had raised money upon the Debentures, but they did not divest themselves at any time of their property in them. They said, "they are our Debentures." And this much he knew, that their means were not such as to warrant them in going on with the works, and it would have been impossible for them to have done so without further aid. In view of the great aid that had been extended to other parts of the (sic) country for railroads, he thought that the Government might come forward and assist the whole of the roads along the same shore.<sup>208</sup>

MR. A. DORION, in reply to the reflection Mr. Bellingham had thought fit to make on the City of Montreal, said the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well why the City of Montreal had not issued debentures for the stock it had subscribed. It was because the whole affair was well known to be a babble, and the company had not complied with one of the conditions upon which the stock was taken up.<sup>209</sup>

MR. LORANGER said he had the honour to present to the House the petition of the inhabitants of St. Martin in order to get an enquiry from the House, and he was ready to go heart and soul with the hon. member for Montreal towards the relief of those inhabitants, but it was not right to accuse the Government as the hon. member had done, without the production of the necessary papers. If any blame was to be put upon any one's shoulders, it should rest upon the Mayor of the place, who had signed papers without any reflection. He wanted this whole matter to be properly sifted in order to see whether it is true that the poor people of Two Mountains had been deceived by the Railroad Company.<sup>210</sup> It might be the duty of the member for Montreal to attack the Government on all occasions, but it was not the best way to serve their Montreal clients, to make accusations prematurely. He wanted inquiry and thought the committee were not liable, but he could not blame the Government for acting on a law passed by that House.<sup>211</sup>

MR. BROWN entirely disagreed with the last hon. member. The hon. member for Montreal had not only pursued the proper course in laying this matter at once before the house, but had done his duty, which, however painful to him, was a necessary one. It was necessary at the earliest part of the session that the House should know the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite had been administering one of the most important trusts reposed in them. The way in which the consolidated loan fund had been administered by the hon. gentlemen opposite, had attracted a great deal of public attention. Was this a subject upon which the hon. Inspector General should sit still, when he heard such grave accusations brought against the Administration?<sup>212</sup> The hon. gentleman opposite could explain it.<sup>213</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said, that they had not an opportunity.<sup>214</sup>

MR. BROWN would sit down and give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to explain.<sup>215</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND thought all debate on the subject was premature, for unlike the member for Montreal, he could not decide without seeing a case on the law of it. He wanted inquiry and if he had made a mistake he would confess he was wrong, but at present he believed he had made no mistake and as to the suits he was said to have brought to quash by-laws he might say he had not brought them, but only lent his name as he was bound to do, to any person who would give security.<sup>216</sup> This was not a matter so easily to be disposed of. Great wrong, he admitted, had been done to the people of Terrebonne in regard to this railroad. (Hear, hear.) The people of Two Mountains complained more of the conduct of their Mayor than of the government! The government were anxious for the production of the papers.<sup>217</sup> Hon. gentlemen had brought the matter up without even reading the papers relating to it. When the papers were brought down he would go into the matter fully.<sup>218</sup>

MR. BROWN thought it was a subject on which the Government ought to be prepared to speak at once. He would say that the debentures were issued illegally.<sup>219</sup> In reply to Mr. Bellingham [he] said the debentures had nothing about the by-law on their face and had nothing to do with their validity on the reverse, for the by-law must be good in order that the debentures should be good. After some other remarks, he concluded by saying that the Government, by the letter of the Receiver General, had justified its conduct by a law which had made a great deal of stir in Upper Canada, viz: the law to legalize debentures irregularly issued. Well it was rather a singular circumstance that that act was read a first time on the very day that these debentures were presented to the Government for exchange. That was a very significant fact.<sup>220</sup>

MR. A. DORION said he was content to wait until the papers should be produced.<sup>221</sup> The motion was then put and carried.<sup>222</sup>

(99)

*On motion of Mr. Antoine Aimé Dorion, seconded by Mr. Brown,*

*Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House:--First, A statement of all the Municipal Debentures of the County of Terrebonne, which have been exchanged by the Government for Provincial Debentures, bearing the guarantee of the Municipal Loan Fund of Lower Canada, or on which advances have been made out of the said Fund. Second, The description or form of the said Municipal Debentures, and of the Provincial Debentures given in exchange*

(100)

*therefor. Third, The names of the persons with whom the said Debentures were exchanged, and the days on which the said Provincial Debentures were delivered to the bearers of the Municipal Debentures. Fourth, Copies of all By-laws, Orders of the Municipal Council, or Orders of His Excellency in Council, in virtue of which the said exchange took place, or the said advances were made; in short, copies of all Correspondence between the Government or the Receiver General, and the Officers of the Municipality and the employés of the Montreal and Bytown Railway Company, and generally, copies of all Correspondence having reference to the exchange of the said Debentures.*

*Ordered, That the said Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, by such Members of this House as are of the Honorable the Executive Council of this Province.*

*Ordered, That Mr. Sidney Smith have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Statutes of this Province respecting Mortgages of personal property in Upper Canada, and to consolidate the same.*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.*

*Ordered, That the Honorable Mr. Merritt have leave to bring in a Bill to extend the Line of the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway Company.<sup>223</sup>*

*He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time To-morrow.*

MR. MERRITT moved for the appointment of a committee to examine into the amount and resources now applicable to the fund for the support of Common Schools, and the establishment of District or Parish Libraries; also, the sources which can be made available for that object, with power to send for persons and papers.<sup>224</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND objected to the motion upon the ground, that it sought to place the whole consolidated revenue fund under the control of this committee and took it out of the government. He saw no objection to the committee reporting upon what sources were now applicable to the fund, but he should desire the words to be struck out "also the sources which can be made available for that object, &c."<sup>225</sup>

MR. MERRITT said if they were struck out it would defeat the object of appointing the committee altogether.<sup>226</sup>

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON said that the motion as amended would involve the Cler[g]y Reserve Fund.<sup>227</sup>

[MR. MERRITT:] This applied only to land, and it was well known that up to the present time we have no capital from the lands of this country applied to the school lands. There was only a paltry revenue of about 3,000L. His object was, not to enquire into the resources of the Clergy Reserves with a view that the committee would submit to the House alterations, nor did he wish to propose any alterations to increase this fund out of the consolidated revenue. It was merely directed to the public lands of the country, and he thought it was the duty of the Government to avail themselves of the assistance of the committee if they could find it out.<sup>228</sup> One million of acres<sup>229</sup> were put aside in 1849 for the purpose of creating common school funds.--That appropriation, however, had not been made, and it was one of the objects of this committee being appointed, that they should investigate the number of acres of land which had been sold, the proceeds thereof, and how applied, and find out when these balances were remaining with the clergy reserve fund, and whether it would be for the interest of the country to apply that to the school fund.<sup>230</sup>

On the suggestion of MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND..., the words "not including the general consolidated revenue of the Province" ... [were] added after the words "for that object"<sup>231</sup>. [He] proposed that the Committee should be named by the House.<sup>232</sup>

The motion was then carried and a Committee appointed.<sup>233</sup>

(100)

*Resolved*, That a Special Committee of five Members be appointed to examine into the amount and resources now applicable to the fund for the support of Common Schools, and the establishment of District or Parish Libraries; also the sources which can be made available for that object, not included in the General Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province; to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

*Ordered*, That the Honorable Mr. Merritt, Mr. Gamble, Mr. James Smith, Mr. Polette, and Mr. Papin, do compose the said Committee.

MR. MERRITT then moved "for the appointment of a committee to investigate the state of the coasting trade, manufacturing and shipping interests, and the state of the commerce of this Province generally, with power to send for persons and papers," and read the names of the members whom he proposed to constitute the committee.<sup>234</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND objected to the committee, and especially on the ground of the Inspector General's name being there. [He objected] to put him on such a committee, to transfer his labors from the council chamber to the committee room, and this upon questions embracing the whole system of trade and taxation of the country.<sup>235</sup> That hon. gentleman [Mr. Cayley] would be delighted to receive suggestions upon those important subjects from the mover<sup>236</sup>.

MR. MERRITT said he did not want to go into the subjects spoken of by the Attorney General; what he desired especially to enquire into was the present position of the coasting trade, which was now being continually engrossed by the Americans.<sup>237</sup>

[MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND:] If that gentleman would come down with resolutions to the House, pointing out the objects he had in view, it would be desirable. To consent to a commission of the kind proposed would be taking out of the hands of the Government the management of all the business of the country in the coasting trade.<sup>238</sup>

MR. MERRITT desired to have the assistance of gentlemen of practical experience; he would therefore, press his motion, and if it differed, he must resort to the expedient of submitting a resolution to the House.<sup>239</sup>

(100)

*The Honorable Mr. Merritt moved, seconded by Mr. Hartman, and the Question being put, That a Select Committee, composed of the Honorable Mr. Spence, the Honorable Mr. Young, Mr. Holton, Mr. Chapais, Mr. Gamble, Mr. Whitney, Mr. Larwill, and the mover be appointed to investigate the state of the Coasting Trade, Manufacturing and Shipping interests, and the state of the Commerce of this Province generally; to report thereon with all convenient speed; with power to send for persons, papers, and records;*

A question having arisen as to the propriety of calling in members previous to a division,<sup>240</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE stated that the rule of the English House of Commons was, never to call in members after the question had been once put from the chair. The advantages of this regulation appeared evident to many members, and it was finally agreed that the rule should be adopted in the Canadian House of Assembly.<sup>241</sup>

(100)

the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:--

YEAS.

Messieurs Aikins, Biggar, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Charles Daoust, Darche, Jean B.E. Dorion, Antoine A. Dorion, Ferrie, Foley, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Jobin, Laberge, Larwill, Lumsden, John S. Macdonald, Roderick McDonald, Mackenzie, Marchildon, Mattice, Merritt, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, Wilson, and Wright.--(36.)

(101)

NAYS.

Messieurs Alleyn, Bell, Bellingham, Bowes, Brodeur, Burton, Cameron, Cartier, Casault, Cauchon, Cayley, Chapais, Chisholm, Church, Clarke, Conger, Cook, Crysler, Jean B. Daoust, Desaulniers, Dionne, Dostaler, Attorney General Drummond, Dufresne, Evanturel, Felton, Ferres, Thomas Fortier, Octave C. Fortier, Fournier, Gamble, Gill, Guévremont, Jackson, Labelle, Laporte, LeBoutillier, Lemieux, Loranger, Sir A.N. MacNab, McCann, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, Angus Morrison, Niles, O'Farrell, Patrick, Poulin, Powell, Price, Rankin, Roblin, Solicitor General Ross, Shaw, Solicitor General Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Somerville, Spence, Stevenson, Thibaudeau, Whitney, and Yeilding.--(64.)

So it pas[s]ed in the Negative.

Ordered, That Mr. Jean Baptiste Eric Dorion have leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Municipal Act of Lower Canada.

He accordingly presented the said Bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time; and ordered to be read a second time on Monday, the seventeenth instant.

[On motion of] MR. S. SMITH<sup>242</sup>,

(101)

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to vest in Samuel Doolittle and Robert Johnston, a certain allowance for Road, in the Township of Haldimand, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

On motion of MR. MUNRO,<sup>243</sup>

(101)

The Order of the day for the second reading of the Bill to vest in John Farley, the younger, of the Township of Darlington, Gentleman, the allowance for road between the North halves of Lots numbers eighteen and nineteen, in the fifth Concession of the Township of Darlington, being read;

The Bill was accordingly read a second time; and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

MR. J. DORION (Drummond) moved the House into committee on the bill to change the tenure of Indian lands in Durham.<sup>244</sup>

(101)

*The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to change the tenure of the Indian Lands in the Township of Durham; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Charles Daoust reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made amendments thereto.*

*Ordered, That the Report be now received.*

*Mr. Charles Daoust reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendments were read, and agreed to.<sup>245</sup>*

*Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time To-mor[r]ow.*

*Then, on motion of Mr. Mackenzie, seconded by Mr. Brown,  
The House adjourned.<sup>246</sup>*

APPENDIX: 5 MARCH 1856.

[NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS RE: CORRIGAN MURDER.]

MR. CAMERON has given notice of a motion for an address to the Governor General, praying that a copy of Mr. Justice Duval's charge to the jury at the trial of Kelly and others, may be sent down to the House.<sup>247</sup>

[QUESTION AND ANSWER RE: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, LOWER CANADA.]

MR. FERRES said that several bills had been introduced for the amendment of the Judiciary system, and if it was the intention of the Government to bring in one general system of their own, ought those other bills to be allowed to proceed? If they were stopped, much expense for printing would be saved.<sup>248</sup>

MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND said (sic) he wished to see all those bills; and some of the Circuits which they proposed might be established with advantage, independently of the Government measure.<sup>249</sup>

[WITHDRAWN MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCE.]

MR. J.S. MACDONALD moved, that it be Resolved, that while this House is prepared to consider any wise measure for the better prevention of crime, and the speedy apprehension of offenders, it will regard with deep regret and alarm the introduction of any measure to divest the local authorities of these duties, and to create a National Police Force under the control of the Provincial Government.

YEAS: Aikins, Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Christie, Cooke, Darche, Delong, J. & A. Dorion, Ferrie, Flint, Frazer, Freeman, Gould, Hartman, Holton, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, J.S. Macdonald, R. McDonald, Mackenzie, Mattice, Munro, Papin, Prévost, Rolph, Scatcherd, Valois, Young.--31.

NAYS: Bellingham, Bowes, Cameron, Cartier, Cauchon, Cayley, Chabot, Chisholm, Clarke, Conger, Crawford, Crysler, Daly, Drummond, Felton, Ferres, Galt, Lemieux, Lumsden, Macbeth, Att. Gen. Macdonald, Masson, Matheson, Meagher, J.C. Morrison, Angus Morrison, Murney, Niles, Powell, Rankin, Roblin, Shaw, Sol. Gen. Smith, Sidney Smith, James Smith, Southwick, Spence, Stevenson, Turcotte, Whitney, &c.--53.<sup>250</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A BILL RE: ELECTIVE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.]

MR. COM. CR. LANDS CAUCHON postponed till Friday, the introduction of his measure, to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council, by making the same Elective.<sup>251</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A BILL RE: PROVINCIAL POLICE FORCE.]

MR. PRES. EX. COUN. MACNAB also postponed till Friday, the introduction of the Government Police Bill.<sup>252</sup>

[POSTPONED MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION RE: DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.]

The next item on the notice-paper was a resolution by Mr. Mackenzie--"That the best interests of Upper and Lower Canada would be promoted by a repeal or dissolution of the political or legislative union now subsisting between these sections of the Province of Canada."<sup>253</sup>

MR. MACKENZIE said he saw the gallant knight was uneasy, and he would therefore let the Union stand for a day or two. (Laughter.)<sup>254</sup>

The motion accordingly was postponed.<sup>255</sup>

[WITHDRAWN BILL RE: L'UNION ST. JOSEPH DE MONTREAL.]

At the request of MR. AT. GEN. DRUMMOND, who intimated that the Government would shortly be prepared with a general Bill of incorporation<sup>256</sup>,

MR. A. DORION withdrew his Bill to incorporate L'Mervin (sic) St. Joseph de Montreal<sup>257</sup>.

FOOTNOTES: 5 MARCH 1856.

1. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
2. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
3. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
4. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
5. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
6. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
7. MORNING CHRONICLE, 11 March 1856.
8. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
9. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
10. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
11. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
12. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
13. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
14. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856, specifies the Commissioner's notice had also been "put up on the door of the department".
15. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
16. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
17. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
18. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
19. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
20. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
21. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
22. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
23. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
24. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
25. IBID.
26. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
27. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
28. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
29. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
30. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856, reports the following excerpt of the said article: " 'A member of the House, indignant at the new rules, had forced his way past the door-keeper and through bolted doors to an inner room, where he found the Chief Commissioner regaling himself with fish and onions.' "
31. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
32. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
33. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856, concurs with this newspaper, but GLOBE, 6 March 1856, reports that Mr. Sicotte "intimated that it would be desirable if hon. members would discontinue the practice of reading newspapers."
34. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
35. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
36. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
37. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
38. IBID.
39. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856. According to GLOBE, 6 March 1856, Mr. J.S. Macdonald explicitly referred to the reading of "the Globe...", during the Debate on the Address."
40. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.

41. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
42. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
43. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856. Mr. Cauchon having returned from a brief sick leave, this newspaper comments: "The Hon. the Crown Lands Commissioner was in his place at the opening of the House, but he did not seem thoroughly recovered from his indisposition."
44. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
45. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
46. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
47. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
48. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
49. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
50. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
51. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
52. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
53. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
54. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
55. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
56. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
57. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
58. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
59. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
60. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
61. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
62. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
63. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
64. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
65. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
66. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
67. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
68. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
69. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
70. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
71. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
72. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
73. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
74. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
75. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
76. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
77. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
78. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
79. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
80. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
81. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
82. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
83. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
84. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
85. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
86. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
87. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
88. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
89. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
90. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.

91. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
92. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
93. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
94. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
95. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
96. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
97. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
98. IBID.
99. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
100. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
101. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
102. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
103. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856, differs from this newspaper and reports the following statement: "The Commissioner of Crown Lands has also said that the clerks were in the habit of locking up their offices during lunch time".
104. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
105. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
106. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
107. IBID.
108. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
109. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
110. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
111. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
112. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
113. IBID.
114. IBID.
115. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
116. IBID.
117. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
118. IBID.
119. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
120. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
121. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
122. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
123. IBID.
124. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
125. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
126. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
127. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
128. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
129. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
130. IBID.
131. IBID.
132. IBID.
133. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
134. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
135. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
136. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
137. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
138. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
139. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
140. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.

141. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
142. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
143. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
144. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
145. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
146. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
147. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
148. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
149. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
150. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
151. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
152. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
153. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
154. IBID.
155. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. LE PAYS, 13 March 1856, provides a long commentary on the question of the recent changes in the Crown Lands Department. Its conclusion is quite similar to Mr. Galt's statement that the reform was a necessary one, but that it might be carried too far. It states, in particular: "Non, ces changemens demandent à être modifiés. Et si M. Cauchon est sincère dans la réforme des abus qui existaient, s'il n'est mu par aucun autre motif que celui du bien public, il reviendra un peu des extrêmes dans lesquels il est tombé. Il atteindra le but qu'il s'est proposé, avec autant d'efficacité; et en faisant les choses d'une manière plus convenable il donnera satisfaction au public." NIAGARA MAIL, 12 March 1856, adds to this: "If Mr. Cauchon's new rules fail to satisfy the public by practical experience, he may expect no mercy as an unsuccessful innovator."
156. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
157. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
158. NIAGARA MAIL, 12 March 1856, gives the following details on this Bill: "The measure is very short and concise. It proposes to declare that no mail shall be made up or despatched on Sunday, that no letters or papers shall be given out from any office on Sunday and that the canal locks shall remain closed from Saturday at midnight, to Sunday at midnight."
159. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
160. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
161. IBID.
162. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
163. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
164. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
165. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
166. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
167. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
168. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
169. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
170. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
171. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856, differs from the other accounts and reports: "Mr. Galt was still not satisfied and vainly endeavored to get other provisos added." Contradicting itself, it later reports a 3rd proviso was inserted in the Act.
172. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
173. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
174. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
175. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.

176. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
177. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
178. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
179. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
180. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
181. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
182. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
183. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856, reports that "17,000L of the money" was paid to the President, but MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856, concurs with the sum of 1,700L reported by the Globe.
184. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
185. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
186. IBID.
187. IBID.
188. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
189. IBID.
190. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
191. IBID.
192. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
193. IBID.
194. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
195. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
196. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
197. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
198. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
199. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
200. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
201. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
202. IBID.
203. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
204. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
205. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
206. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
207. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
208. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
209. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
210. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
211. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
212. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
213. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
214. IBID.
215. IBID.
216. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
217. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
218. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
219. IBID.
220. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 7 March 1856.
221. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 7 March 1856.
222. IBID.
223. GLOBE, 6 March 1856, and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856, both specify the purpose of this Bill is to extend the said Railway "via Allanburgh, Port Robinson and Merrittville, to Port Colborne".
224. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.

225. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
226. IBID.
227. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
228. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
229. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
230. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
231. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
232. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
233. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
234. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
235. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
236. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
237. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
238. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856, provides a short summary which helps to clarify this statement. It reports that Mr. Merritt "was requested to confine himself to some specific branch of the subject, and bring in some sort of tangible resolutions bearing upon that point".
239. MONTREAL GAZETTE, 8 March 1856.
240. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
241. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856. GLOBE, 6 March 1856, describes this short interruption as "some further discussion of a confused character".
242. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
243. IBID.
244. IBID.
245. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856, reports one amendment, "that in case of any difference arising, they should be referred to the Superintendent General of Indian affairs, whose decision should be final."
246. GLOBE, 6 March 1856, and TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856, both report the House adjourned at ten o'clock.
247. GLOBE, 7 March 1856. Although this notice of motion is undated, it seems likely it was given today, so as to respect the rule of the House which requires that notice be given at least two days prior to any motion for leave to present an Address (Mr. Cameron moves his Address on the 7th March 1856). It remains possible, however, that the notice was given either on the 4th or the 6th March 1856. Other newspapers, such as WESTERN PLANET, 13 March 1856, also provide an undated report of this notice.

MONTREAL GAZETTE, 14 March 1856, adds this brief comment: "A very strong feeling prevails here upon the subject, and in Mr. Cameron's hands, if he pushes the matter on, will lead to some pretty discussion probably." A comment from PERTH COURIER, 21 March 1856, suggests this notice might have generated some discussion: "When the notice of motion was first given, it was opposed by the Ministry on the ground of its being unconstitutional."
248. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
249. IBID.
250. MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856. This motion has been arbitrarily inserted in this day, since this newspaper does not specify when exactly it was introduced. This is the only report of the motion and its vote. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the JOURNALS that a vote was taken on such a motion at any time.
251. GLOBE, 6 March 1856.
252. IBID.
253. IBID.
254. IBID.

255. GLOBE, 6 March 1856. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856, faultily reports the resolution "was put, and instantly lost." MACKENZIE'S WEEKLY MESSAGE, 7 March 1856, answers with the following short commentary: "Yesterday's Leader is in error. No resolution of Mr. Mackenzie's for repeal was moved or negatived on Wednesday night. It was delayed till it could be seen on Mr. Brown's resolutions, if there is the slightest chance of the French agreeing to population as the basis of representation."
256. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856.
257. TORONTO DAILY LEADER, 6 March 1856. This information appears somewhat awkward since the JOURNALS report the Bill was read a second time on the 5th June 1856.



## INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

### INTRODUCTION

The following Index applies only to the names of men who were members of the Legislative Assembly in the Fifth Parliament, Second Session, for the period covered in this volume, that is 15 February 1856 to 5 March 1856 inclusive. It refers to every occasion a member proposed or seconded a motion or resolution, or brought up a petition; it refers to every speech he delivered during debates or to every other time he addressed the House; and also when he took the chair of the House in Committee of the Whole, or was appointed to sit on a Committee. Only individual votes are excluded because divisions rightfully belong with the legislation they pertain to, and all legislation is included in the subject Index.

The letter "f" after the page number indicates a member's speech or motion referred to in the footnote pages. The punctuation (?) following a page number indicates there is reason to doubt that the member made the speech or moved the motion. The reader is advised to refer to the appropriate footnote in the footnote pages for an explanation.

As explained in the Introduction to this Volume, the subject Index for the entire Volume will be contained in the final part.



## PROPER NAMES

### A

Aikins, James Cox, 15, 93, 247, 297, 298, 384, 385, 439, 477.

Alleyn, Charles, 92, 147, 197, 244, 262, 374, 387, 388, 410, 440, 443.

### B

Bell, Robert, 14, 93, 405, 439, 457.

Bellingham, Sydney, 39, 73-74, 91, 93, 353-354, 376, 410, 448, 459, 502, 502-503.

Biggar, Herbert, 93, 197, 261, 333, 372, 405, 439, 457.

Blanchet, Jean, 92.

Bourassa, François, 93, 247, 422.

Bowes, John George, 45, 93, 139, 180, 181, 181-182, 183, 187-188, 371, 384, 385, 439.

Brodeur, Timothée, 14, 93, 196.

Brown, George, 3, 6, 7, 29-30, 30, 35, 36, 47, 93, 100, 101, 102, 105-106, 106, 107, 107-108, 108, 108-109, 109, 109-110, 110, 110-111, 111, 111-112, 112, 112-113, 113, 113-114, 114-116, 116, 116-117, 117, 118, 118-120, 120-122, 122-123, 123, 123-124, 124, 124-125, 125, 126, 127, 130, 135, 136, 155, 159, 177, 185, 187, 220, 228, 244, 245, 246, 247, 302-303, 303, 304, 305, 306, 306-307, 310, 311, 333, 337-340, 340, 340-341, 343, 356, 356-357, 358, 379, 381, 386, 387, 408, 415, 417-418, 418, 419, 420, 423, 424, 425, 432, 433, 435, 444, 445, 460, 462, 463, 477, 497, 503, 504, 508.

Bureau, Jacques Olivier, 41, 93, 166, 246-247, 379, 384, 389.

Burton, Francis H., 92.

### C

Cameron, John Hillyard, 13, 16, 38, 41-42, 42, 93, 116, 117, 118, 155, 155-159, 159, 159-160, 244, 247, 298-299, 299, 300, 333, 336, 348-349, 349, 351, 376, 377, 378, 381, 386, 397, 408-409, 416, 439, 445, 445-446, 446, 451, 468-469, 469, 477, 509.

Cartier, Georges Etienne, 16, 57, 60, 63-64, 64, 64-65, 65, 65-66, 66-67, 67, 67-68, 69, 70, 93, 112, 113, 120, 186, 213, 214, 233, 270, 295, 305, 374, 375, 381, 396, 405, 409, 421, 470, 498.

Casault, Louis Eldemar Napoléon, 91, 93, 311, 406, 411, 444.

Cauchon, Joseph Edouard, 93, 94, 185, 186, 211, 212, 216-218, 218, 218-220, 220, 220-223, 235, 333, 360, 485-489, 492, 496, 505, 509.

Cayley, William, 34, 77, 77-78, 82, 117, 135, 135-136, 136, 147, 171, 261, 296-297, 334, 347-348, 349, 358, 360, 380, 390, 397, 406, 422, 440, 444, 445, 447-448, 451, 456f, 457, 462, 462-463, 463.

Chabot, Jean, 92, 271-273, 273-274, 355, 372.

Chapais, Jean Charles, 45, 91, 93, 275-276, 297, 314, 356, 384, 439, 506.

Chisholm, George King, 45, 93, 197, 371, 457.

Christie, David, 45, 93, 137, 212, 309, 371, 384, 432, 439, 459, 497.

Church, Basil Rorison, 45, 93, 196, 371, 384, 438, 443, 457.

Clarke, William, 93, 359, 432, 433, 434.

Conger, Wilson Seymour, 34, 50-51, 51, 93, 107, 261, 314, 477.

Cook, Ephraim.

Cooke, Alanson, 40, 93, 261, 270-271, 378, 477.

Crawford, George, 93, 196, 471.

Crysler, John Pliny, 92.

## D

Daly, Thomas Mayne, 93, 314.

Daoust, Charles, 13, 31, 85, 93, 137, 197, 265-269, 269-270, 270, 293, 317f, 318f, 375, 377, 378, 392, 395, 439, 464, 508.

Daoust, Jean Baptiste, 93, 197.

Darche, Noël, 93, 137, 381, 384.

Delong, Jesse, 93.

Desaulniers, Louis Léon Lesieur, 93, 276, 276-278, 378, 444.

DeWitt, Jacob, 93, 384, 466.

Dionne, Benjamin, 93.

Dorion, Antoine Aimé, 13, 16, 31-32, 35, 54-57, 57-58, 58, 59, 62, 64, 67, 68-69, 69-70, 70, 93, 132, 133-134, 138, 163, 187, 197, 246, 337, 354-355, 376, 377, 380, 381, 383, 386, 387, 412, 414, 419-420, 420, 422, 438, 444, 445, 447, 452, 453, 460(?), 463, 464, 465, 469, 477, 497, 498, 498-501, 501, 502, 503, 504, 510.

Dorion, Jean Baptiste Eric, 8, 13, 13-14, 16, 39, 41, 46, 93, 139, 146f, 183-184, 380, 381, 384, 389, 391, 405, 460(?), 507.

Dostaler, Pierre Eustache, 93.

Drummond, Lewis Thomas, 6, 16, 93, 243, 261, 262, 269, 270, 287-292, 292-293, 306, 314, 316, 318f, 336, 349-351, 354, 355, 359, 360, 361, 371, 374, 376, 378, 380, 383, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 394-395, 395, 396, 408, 409, 410, 414, 414-415, 415, 421, 422, 439, 444, 445, 446, 448, 448-449, 450, 451, 453, 460, 464, 465, 465-466, 466, 469, 470, 472, 501-502, 504, 505, 506, 509, 510.

Dufresne, Joseph, 34, 42, 91, 92, 196, 227, 227-228, 228, 261, 314, 371, 390, 391, 422, 438, 450, 491-492, 492-493, 497.

## E

Egan, John, 92.

Evanturel, François, 13, 48-50, 51, 91, 93, 109, 333, 406, 411, 412, 477.

## F

Fellowes (see Lyon).

Felton, William Locker Pickmore, 93, 184-185, 285-287, 359, 372, 384, 418, 418-419, 419, 420, 421, 423, 423-424, 424, 425, 432, 433, 434, 439, 443, 446, 467-468, 477.

Fergusson, Adam Johnston, 92, 93.

Ferres, James Moir, 38, 48, 82-83, 93, 138, 182, 352, 359, 372, 375, 381, 382, 383, 418, 425, 433, 434, 435, 443, 444, 445, 509.

Ferrie, Robert, 93, 137, 147, 184, 392, 393, 438, 444, 447, 457.

Flint, Billa, 16, 93, 372, 383, 384.

Foley, Michael Hamilton, 83, 84, 93, 167-169, 169, 169-170, 170, 170-171, 171, 171-172, 172, 172-174, 178, 333, 385, 416.

Fortier, Octave Cyrille, 93.

Fortier, Thomas, 41, 47, 93, 170, 196, 261, 371, 381, 420, 448, 449, 450.

Fournier, Charles François, 93.

Frazer, John, 92, 138, 197, 333, 371, 385, 477.

Freeman, Samuel Black, 34, 92, 137, 147, 237-240, 240-241, 333, 383-384, 387, 389, 405, 417, 439.

## G

Galt, Alexander Tilloch, 41, 75-77, 77, 93, 301, 336, 380, 412, 413, 491.

Gamble, John William, 93, 223-225, 225, 225-227, 416, 506.

Gill, Ignace, 93, 196, 497.

Gould, Joseph, 93, 385.

Guévremont, Jean Baptiste, 34, 93, 197, 262, 439.

## H

Hartman, Joseph, 7, 8, 15, 34, 47, 71-72, 93, 181, 182-183, 183, 185, 309, 333, 372, 384, 384-385, 385, 387, 389, 405, 421, 439, 451, 452, 457, 471, 472, 497, 506.

Holton, Luther Hamilton, 34, 36, 93, 125, 185, 197, 211, 212, 213, 213-214, 214, 214-215, 216, 220, 262, 299-300, 300-301, 336, 390, 393-394(?), 395(?), 396(?), 405, 408, 412, 413, 421, 422, 440, 506.

Huot, Pierre Gabriel, 333, 360, 361, 420.

## J

Jackson, George, 32, 34, 93, 179-180, 261, 372, 384, 459.

Jobin, Joseph Hilarion, 13, 93, 245, 388, 448, 457, 458.

## L

Labelle, Pierre, 93, 457.

Laberge, Charles Joseph, 39, 92, 137, 138-139, 372, 379, 386, 389, 390, 422, 467.

Laporte, Joseph, 93, 196, 249f, 405.

Larwill, Edwin, 45, 93, 241, 261, 410, 438, 506.

LeBoutillier, John, 47, 93.

Lemieux, François Xavier, 197, 391, 395, 411.

Loranger, Thomas Jean Jacques, 9, 13, 15, 16, 38, 41, 85, 93, 160-161, 161, 161-163, 163-164, 164-166, 166-167, 187, 189, 196, 244, 248, 278-280, 280-281, 281-283, 314, 344, 355, 372, 375, 377, 378, 381, 386, 388, 393, 406, 411, 443, 444, 458, 464, 465, 467, 503.

Lumsden, John MacVeigh, 93, 386, 405, 471.

Lyon (Fellowes), George Byron, 93.

## M

Macbeth, George, 93, 147, 459-460.

McCann, Henry Wellesly, 92, 247, 261, 306, 477.

Macdonald, John Alexander, 93, 108, 125-126, 126-127, 127-128, 129-130, 130-132, 136, 172, 301, 303, 304, 306, 309-310, 310, 311, 334, 341-343, 343, 343-344, 344, 345, 351, 356, 360, 386, 419, 420, 434, 435, 460-461, 461, 461-462, 471, 472.

Macdonald, John Sandfield, 16, 30, 32, 35, 39-40, 93, 94, 96-99, 100, 104, 112, 140f, 185, 261, 301, 336, 344-345, 345-346, 358, 361, 371, 374, 378, 381, 386, 393, 395, 409, 409-410, 410-411, 411, 412, 413, 420, 421, 440, 444, 451, 457, 466, 471, 473f, 481-484, 484, 485, 492, 494, 495-496, 496, 497, 509.

McDonald, Roderick, 93, 405, 457.

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 7, 8, 93, 117, 134, 134-135, 135, 174, 175, 228, 237, 243, 281, 283, 284, 284-285, 295, 296, 298, 307, 357, 375, 380-381, 383, 384, 386, 387, 392-393, 439, 444, 446, 447, 506, 508, 510.

MacNab, Allan Napier, 4, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 36-37, 37, 46, 47, 48, 83, 84, 92, 93, 94, 134, 136, 139, 147, 148, 150, 175, 175-176, 176, 177, 178, 185, 186, 187, 189, 194f, 328f, 386, 457, 459, 470, 472, 484, 484-485, 509.

Marchildon, Thomas, 93, 371, 445.

Masson, Luc Hyacinthe, 42, 93, 185, 274-275, 275, 359, 390, 419, 423, 424, 433, 434, 443, 477.

Matheson, Donald, 93, 333, 386.

Mattice, William, 93.

Meagher, John, 93.

Merritt, William Hamilton, 6, 13, 16, 40, 45, 59-60, 60-62, 62, 91, 93, 147, 244-245, 261, 333, 371, 372, 402f, 430f, 439, 447, 457, 505, 506.

Mongenais, Jean Baptiste, 93.

Morrison, Angus, 13, 93, 235-236, 237, 334, 410, 471.

Morrison, Joseph Curran, 16, 91, 93, 357-358, 371, 374, 382.

Munro, Henry, 93, 147, 199, 317f, 333, 408, 507.

Murney, Edmund, 83, 84, 93, 242, 243, 343, 344, 393-394(?), 395(?), 396(?), 494-495.

## N

Niles, William E., 93, 438, 477.

## O

O'Farrell, John, 93.

## P

Papin, Joseph, 13, 32, 93, 167, 229-233, 233, 233-235, 235, 292, 301, 355, 377, 379, 394, 395, 406, 438, 506.

Patrick, William, 40, 93, 138, 196, 384, 417, 477.

Polette, Antoine, 92, 93, 457, 506.

Poulin, Joseph Napoléon, 93, 334, 384, 438, 463.

Pouliot, Barthelemi, 42, 122, 123, 228-229, 229, 287, 390.

Powell, William Frederick, 13, 36, 39, 93, 94, 216, 240, 262, 346, 388, 393, 410, 413, 416, 417, 439, 448, 489-490, 490-491.

Prévost, Gédéon Mélasippe, 93, 196, 375, 440, 464.

Price, David Edward, 93, 261, 386.

## R

Rankin, Arthur, 15, 45, 93, 150-152, 155, 247, 348, 372, 388.

Rhodes, William, 45, 93, 137, 178-179, 179, 196, 354, 386, 405, 444, 458.

Robinson, William Benjamin, 7, 8, 62, 63, 91, 93, 94, 178, 333, 354, 355, 371, 374, 388, 410, 415, 450, 458, 493, 494.

Roblin, David, 93, 197, 314, 376, 438.

Rolph, John, 93.

Ross, Dunbar, 92, 405, 410, 411, 412.

Ross, James, 93.

## S

Sanborn, John Sewell, 93, 359, 384, 432, 433, 467.

Scatcherd, John, 93, 333, 405.

Shaw, James, 93, 261, 333.

Sicotte, Louis Victor, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 16, 32, 34, 37, 47, 59, 80, 102, 105, 139, 175, 179, 196, 212, 213, 220, 229, 233, 248, 261, 265, 283, 284, 287, 294, 296, 299, 303, 304, 311, 336, 346, 353, 356, 359, 371, 374, 382, 383, 394, 395, 405, 411, 412, 413, 414, 419, 438, 457, 471, 472, 484, 485, 501, 502.

Smith, Henry, 6, 8, 30, 37, 47, 48, 84, 102, 112, 136, 148, 186, 199, 243, 262, 311, 316, 343, 348, 438, 352-353, 353, 359, 389, 438, 452, 495.

Smith, James, 31, 40, 45, 93, 123, 197, 261, 296, 340, 348, 374, 375, 376, 406, 416, 439, 506.

Smith, Sidney, 8, 32, 34, 35, 38, 48, 58, 93, 100, 100-101, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 110, 118, 138, 147, 169, 170, 196, 262, 333, 336, 337, 354, 408, 409, 412, 415, 416, 417, 438, 458, 505, 507.

Somerville, Robert Brown, 38, 93, 196, 371, 376, 378, 391, 396, 397, 438, 477.

Southwick, George, 16, 45, 91, 93, 241, 383, 406, 439, 477.

Spence, Robert, 91, 92, 116, 199, 202-204, 204-211, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 307-309, 309, 406, 506.

Stevenson, David Barker, 74-75, 91, 93, 185, 355, 359, 381, 418, 432, 433, 434, 457, 480.

## T

Taché, Joseph Charles, 384, 386.

Terrill, Timothy Lee, 93.

Thibaudeau, Joseph Elie, 75, 93, 247, 411, 438, 472.

Turcotte, Joseph Edouard, 93, 262, 287, 351-352, 358, 371, 386, 450.

## V

Valois, Michel François, 93, 139, 244, 317f, 388.

## W

Whitney, Hannibal Hodges, 16, 34, 93, 372, 506.

Wilson, John, 36, 65, 66, 78-80, 80-82, 92, 197, 293, 347, 348, 359, 416, 423, 432, 433, 434, 461, 496.

Wright, Amos, 93, 336, 384.

## Y

Yeilding, Agar, 91, 93, 262, 388.

Young, John, 13, 16, 70-71, 72-73, 83, 93, 182, 197, 245, 336, 371, 388, 391, 392, 438, 443, 457, 506.







3 1761 11465297 7

